Mr. Watson's Editorials On the War Issues

[Thomas Edward Watson]

Ga. W

(REPRINTED FROM THE JEFFERSONIAN)

Press of
THE JEFFERSONIAN PUB. CO.
THOMSON, GA.
1917

Mr. Watson's Editorials On the War Issues

(Reprinted from The Jeffersonian)

COMMON SENSE COMMENTS ON THE GREAT WAR

In order that you may have in your mind a picture of the battle-field in Northern France, where four millions of Christians, (supplied with Bibles, chaplains, and regular prayers, on each side) are murdering one another, according to President Wilson's "proud punctilio," I will ask you to reflect upon a few of the actual facts.

First of all, you must realize that the length of the battle-line is only about 50 miles, and its width less than ten.

Try to imagine the crowding of that small territory by four million men, tens of thousands of horses; millions of cannon, motor cars, trucks, wagons, piles of ammunition, food depots, sleeping quarters, field-hospitals, &c.

Imagine the vast net-work of trenches, in which the men on duty at the front have to live, sleep, and fight.

Imagine a deafening roar of cannon-thunder, lasting all night and all day, every day in the week, every week in the month.

Imagine tens of thousands of soldiers making charges, every few hours, on several parts of this short battle-line; and imagine those soldiers falling, under the terrible fire of cannon, machine-guns, rifles, and hand-grenades.

Imagine at least one hundred thousand of these soldiers killed along that short line, every month; and twice as many wounded.

The wounded, of course, are carried to the rear, sent to hospitals, and treated perhaps with every possible consideration.

But what about the dead?

There is no place to bury them, and no time for it.

589145

All the ground is cut up into trenches: there is no room for burial on separate soil.

What, then, becomes a dreadful military necessity?

The corpses must be piled up, like so many cords of wood, *soaked in kerosene oil, and burnt to ashes.*

In the Augusta *Herald*, of last Sunday, appears the following, which shows that some of the heroic soldiers are *not* burned:

Germany is making soap, oils, fertilizer and pig-feed out of slain soldiers' bodies.

Reports of rendering plants for human flesh have been published before, but newspapers from Germany and Holland, just received, contain details of this horrible industry never told in America.

From Belgians who have been deported into Germany to work, and who have escaped, the newspaper "La Belgique," published in Leyden, Holland, obtains details, which are included in the following article:

"We have known for long that the Germans stripped their dead behind the firing line, fastened them into bundles of three or four bodies with iron wire, and then dispatched these grisly bundles to the rear.

"Until recently the trains laden with the dead were sent to Seraing, near Liege, and a point north of Brussels, where were refuse consumers.

"German science is responsible for the ghoulish idea of the formation of the German Offal-Conversion Company, Ltd. ('D. A. V. G.') or 'Deutsche Abfall-Gerwertung Gasellschaft'), a dividend-earning company with a capital of $1,250,000, the chief factory of which has been constructed 1,000 yards from the railway connecting St. Vith, near the Belgian frontier, with Gerolstein, in the lonely, little-frequented Eifel district, southwest of Coblentz.

"The factory deals specially with the dead from the west front. If the results are as good as the company hopes, another will be established to deal with corpses on the east front.

"The trains arrive full of bare bodies, which are unloaded by the workers, who live at the works.

"The men wear oilskin overalls and masks with mica eyepieces. They are equipped with long hooked poles and push the bundles of bodies to an endless chain which picks them up with big hooks, attached at intervals of two feet.

"The bodies are transported on this endless chain into a long, narrow compartment, where they pass through a scalding bath which disinfects them. They then go through a drying chamber and finally are automatically carried into a digester or great cauldron, in which they are dropped by an apparatus which detaches them from the chain.

In the digester they remain from six to eight hours, and are treated by steam, which breaks them up, while they are slowly stirred by machinery. The bones sink to the bottom, leaving a thick, dark-colored liquid.

Southern Pamphlets
Rare Book Collection
UNC-Chapel Hill

"From this treatment result several products. The fats are broken up into stearine, a form of tallow, and oils, which require to be re-distilled before they can be used. The process of distillation is carried out by boiling the oil with carbonate of soda, and some part of the by-products resulting from this is used by German soap makers."

Not from neutral Holland, but from a great newspaper printed in Germany itself—the Berlin Lokalanzeiger—come still more startling details of the uses made of extracts from human flesh.

Karl Rosner, special Lokalanzeiger correspondent with the armies on the western front, states there is, north of Rheims, a German factory for "converting corpses" into lubricating oils, fertilizers and fodder for pigs.

The fertilizers are obtained from the refuse and bones, ground together.

The foregoing reads like a description of a Chicago packing-house, where hogs are handled by machinery; and where if a workman happens to fall into the boiling vats, he is made up into lard, or sausage, along with the other stuff.

It is certainly a grewsome thought, that our gallant young men, conscripted to fight the Germans, may be made into soap, oil, fertilizer, and hog-feed.

The German troops cannot help themselves. For 30 years they have been ruthlessly drilled into blind obedience: their Kaiser and their "nobly-born" officers have so persistently treated them as if they were senseless automatons, that they *are* senseless automatons. *Their military system made them so.*

They do not dare to protest, when they are ordered to feed the cannon and the machine guns with more human fodder: they dumbly go, and they bravely die. *For what?*

They do not know, and dare not inquire.

The English troops are volunteers: they had been made to believe—perhaps correctly—that German success against France would mean the ruin of England.

At any rate, *they* are at the battle-line voluntarily, and *they* can tell you why they volunteered.

The Frenchmen, standing on their own soil, know why they are fighting. *They* are prompted by the noblest patriotism that ever inspires soldiers—the same that nerved the heroes of Marathon, of Bannockburn, of King's Mountain, of Yorktown, of Manassas, and of Gettysburg.

They are beating back the invaders of their homes.

When men fight on that principle, the foundation is granite, the cause is holy, and the sacrifice immortal.

So much for the armies engaged.

But what about an American army going over?

What about burning a few thousand cords of dead Americans?

What about a carload of German soap, made out of our boys? What about manuring German fields with our bravest youth, and fattening German hogs on the choicest selection from American manhood?

"I raised my boy to be a soldier!" says the song; but did mother raise him to be pig-feed?

Was it for service in Europe, that American parents reared their sons, paid for their education, and prepared them for life?

Is the end of all their parental love, care, and ambition to be, a ghastly contribution to a pile of corpses in France, soaked in kerosene, and fired like a stack of wood?

Is there somewhere, *in the soul of things*, an imperative demand for a supreme American sacrifice, admonishing us to acquiesce, humbly and unquestioningly, *when autocratic authority violates the Constitution of the United States*, and orders the flower of young American manhood to cut loose from home, loved ones, and country, and to cheerfully take the road which leads to the horrible factories where dead soldiers are converted into oil for machinery and food for hogs?

What got *us* into the War?

I thought we Democrats re-elected Professor Wilson, *to keep us out.*

Isn't that your understanding?

It hurts my feelings to hear a man—who voted for Wilson because "he kept us out of war"—*now* say, "he kept us out, *as long as he could.*"

Didn't Germany do her *worst*, before the November election?

She certainly did.

What has she done, *since?*

As soon as Wilson had "kissed the Book," at his second inauguration, he drew his sword on the Kaiser.

What for?

I'd love to see somebody run a sword clean through the Kaiser; but this feeling was strongest just after he murdered the non-combatant tourists on the passenger ship *Lusitania.*

He has never done anythin, since, half so atrocious as *that*, and he never can do anything *worse.*

If President Wilson didn't hit him *then*, why hit him *now?*

Why was it all postponed until after the election?

Why make war on account of crimes that we *condoned?*

It was after the German crimes of 1914 and 1915, that Ambassador Gerard—fresh from a visit to President Wilson—made the banquet speech in Berlin, telling the Kaiser's government that the friendly relations between them and us were never better!

What new departure from her war policies and practises did Germany make, after that?

She didn't make any.

What *motives* are leading our Republic into this furious world-war? What do we seek?

What German possession do we covet? What has she done to us, that *our Navy* is unable to avenge and redress and rectify?

For Heaven's sake, think it over!

Don't get drunk on words, by absorption. Try to fix your mind on actual facts.

What dangers threaten us?

Where are we attacked?

How came we to be involved in this European maelstrom?

No German soldier has harmed us. No German army faces us. The wide, wide ocean rolls between us. German troops are battling for dear life, right now, to keep from having to re-cross the Rhine.

Every gun, every horse, every man that Germany can bring up, *has been brought up*, to bar the avenging French out of German territory.

Don't you know that?

Can't our ruling powers see it?

Why, then, should we compel our young men *to go to Europe*, when no part of Europe can possibly come against us?

The idea of German soldiers attacking *us*, is monstrous. It would be laughable, if the tragic element were not so terribly predominant.

Germany assail us?

God in Heaven! Germany's night-mare, *right now*, is the vision of the infuriated Frenchman, on the German side of the Rhine, wreaking his pent-up wrath upon German mothers, wives, daughters, and helpless children, in retaliation for the indescribable horrors which German soldiers have inflicted upon the innocent non-combatants of France.

Another article in the Augusta *Herald*, last Sunday, began thus:

London (By Mail).—"I live now for only one thing, for I have lost everything—my husband, my sons, my home, my only daughter, who was ruined by a German devil. I am going to pray to

President F...care that one day he will give a German into my hands, that I may tear out his eyes with my own fingers."

That is what an old French woman said to Miss E. Almaz Stout, in the region just reconquered by the British from the Germans. Miss Stout has just come from that stricken portion of France. She brought back with her memories of terrible scenes, awful suffering and hardship, and a people stricken wantonly to earth as their German foes retreated.

I spare you the details.

Do you suppose that the consuming hatred, burning in the old French woman's heart, is absent from the hearts of the French soldiers?

And can you imagine that the Germans do not *know* what they may expect, when the turn of the Frenchman comes?

They *do* know what to expect, and they are fighting frantically, straining every nerve, to stave off that fearful day of French revenge!

Seeing actual conditions as I do, through the metropolitan papers of the East and North, I have scant patience with Americans who have gone wild at the Bugaboo of a German invasion.

A friend out in Texas presents a view which doubtless prevails widely:

Dear Sir: Granted that Germany secures a victory over her enemies, and demands the possession of their navies as the price of that victory. She then comes into possession of the English, the French, and the Italian navies. These and her own are practically unimpaired. Would she be able to unite these fleets and assail, successfully, our Atlantic Sea Ports and the Panama Canal? Would she, in fact, have to land an army of conquest in order to demand and enforce of us the payment of her vast war debt? Would our navy and land fortifications enable us to preserve such cities as Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Baltimore, and on down the line to Galveston? And what about Tampico, and the Mexican oil supply?

Let us have your views on the above statements and questions in the Jeff. Yours truly,

The writer is a gentleman who is far above the average in education and intelligence. Let us reason together:

If "Germany secures a victory."

Must we plunge into the war, *with no better footing than an* IF?

Let me answer, with an "*if*," or two.

If Germany couldn't secure a victory when she caught England napping, how can she hope to secure it now, after England has raised an army of five million men?

If Germany could not secure a victory when she was advancing upon Paris with all her banners flying, how can she hope to do it now, when her disasters have cost the lives of a million of her best troops, and when she is no longer able to regain any lost ground?

If the German people, full fed and full *ready*, could not defeat France—*almost* taken by surprise—how can she now hope to do it, when the German people are exhausted, half-starved, and heart-sick of the War?

If Germany could not secure a victory when her allies were whole-hearted in their unity, how can she now hope to do it, when Austria, Turkey, and Bulgaria are separately intriguing for peace, *through the pope?*

Why should the United States, near the end of the third year of the war, when Germany is losing on all fronts, be more afraid of her than we were during the first year, when she was victorious on all fronts?

Her fleet ventured out once, and then limped back, to stay.

Not a German flag is to be seen on all the seas.

Her raiders have been sunk; her battleships driven to shelter, and bottled up; her merchant fleet annihilated.

Her submarines sink a few fishing smacks, and freight schooners. That's all.

Five thousand vessels go in and out of the English ports, *every week:* the submarines have never sunk as many as 40 a week, of these real ships of the merchant marine.

Forty out of 5,000!

And the English ship-yards are turning out new ships, faster than the German U-boats can sink the old ones!

So, you see, when we reason together, the danger of German victory, and German conquest of all the fleets, fades into nothingness.

(Since the above was written, the sinkings of English vessels has dropped to 15 a week!)

The New York *World*—staunchest of Democratic Wilson papers—had an account last week of the profits which young J. P. Morgan had thus far made out of the war.

The amount was ninety million dollars.

A long life of Wall Street piracy had given the elder Morgan a fortune of $75,000,000.

He had enjoyed succulent favors from many Presidents, and had put his honest little sickle into many a luscious bond-deal, including that midnight deal with his ex-attorney, President Cleveland.

But the Civil War bonds, the many refunding shuffles, the

Central of Georgia Railroad manipulations, the Steel Trust organization, and sundry other virtuous brigandages and corsairages, had left the old man blessed in worldly goods to the extent of only $75,000,000.

The son of Morgan, the Wall Street Pirate, was a basketful of chips off the paternal block; and, as luck would have it, the European War commenced almost at the same time that these paternal chips got into the Street.

In less than three years, the younger Morgan has made, out of the War, more than his honored and lamented father made out of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, the Panama hand-made "Revolution;" the Chinese War, and three well-grown *Panics*, two of which Morgan himself precipitated.

Ninety million dollars in three years, comes to thirty a year, or more than two millions a month.

The New York *World* reports that Morgan made $18,000,000 on one loan for the Allies, "floated" by him at the modest rate of 12 per cent commission.

I guess he owns a Life Insurance Company, bought the paper of the Allies with his Insurance surplus, and put the commission in his private pocket.

Now, when you regard Morgan as a *type*, rather than as an individual, and remember that he represents the greed of soulless Capitalists incorporated by law, favored by legislation ever since the War between the States, fortified by court decisions made by lawyers whom they elevated to the bench, and constantly guarded from the peril of reformatory measures by their docile serfs in the Governmental livery, you can begin to see what are the selfishly sordid *sources* of all this fanatical clamor for an American army in Europe.

What do such Capitalists care, if a hundred thousand of *your* sons are freighted to German factories, and boiled into oil, made into soap, mixed for fertilizer, or prepared as pig-feed?

My countrymen! The deadliest danger to your country and to your liberties *lies on this side of the ocean.*

American Prussianism is not aimed at German Prussia: it is aimed *at* the plundered American producers; and aimed *by* the plundering non-producers.

The Standing Army is to be built up, on the Prussian model, for the purpose of maintaining and perpetuating an infernal system of class-legislation, which enriches the non-producing classes, by the pillage of the producing masses.

The Standing Army's real purpose is, to support a heart-

less Aristocracy of Dollars, whose patents of nobility are written in the "laws" which confer Special Privileges upon incorporated wealth.

You see a few grey-headed men sitting on the side-walk, or on the piazza of the cross-roads store: ask them how the world of today compares with the world that they lived in, before the War between the States.

They will tell you, that the world of today is altogether different.

Everything is changed, and not for the better.

Before 1860, there were no price-fixing Trusts; no monopolies intrenched in Federal legislation; no railroad lawyers controlling the courts; no gag-laws threatening the press; no legalized Money Trust financing gigantic Speculations which rob the people; no huge national debt devouring in taxes the substance of the producers; no artificial inequalities in the distribution of the common wealth, caused by congressional laws which enable one class to despoil all the others; no stupendous fortunes heaped up by law on one side of the street, while the other side of the same street is littered with the pitiful wrecks of wronged humanity.

No! None of these terrible conditions existed before the War of the Sixties.

The tears will fill the eyes of the old folks as they tell you how different the country used to be.

What changed it so?

The War.

The Spanish-American War gave another tremendous impulse to Imperialism, Centralism, Capitalism, Special Privilege, and Dollar Autocracy.

Under President Wilson, those consolidating tendencies have been enormously advanced. No check whatever has been placed upon the Supreme Sovereignty of the Specially Privileged Dollar.

And now those Sovereign Dollars, mad with insatiable lust *for more*, are driving you headlong into the vastest whirlpool known to history; and not one of your sentinels upon the watch-tower has the foresight and courage to warn you of the breakers ahead.

It is sad beyond words.

In the most appalling crisis of our national life, we look in vain for *A Man*.

We yearn for a leader—a Saul whose head lifts itself above

the crowd; a strong man who has the eye to see, and the soul that is not afraid.

But we yearn vainly. We have no strong man. We have no leader. We have no statesman at the helm.

Once upon a time, Daniel Webster stood forth in the Senate, challenged the Federal Administration, and said with a voice that no President dared to ignore—

"*You have no constitutional right to conscript American citizens into an army.*"

The greatest constitutional lawyer that ever lived spoke thus to President Madison, during the War of 1812; and the conscription bill died, under Webster's herculean blows.

True, the Union conscripted men in the third year of the Civil War, when the Republic was in the throes of a titanic civil convulsion; but it was done as an extreme, self-preserving *war measure.*

No such imperative necessity exists now.

No such imperative necessity can ever again arise.

Then *why* conscript a million men?

•

The Catholic prelates are publicly jubilant over the fact, that they have already made our Navy 40 per cent Romanist.

Nearly one-half!

Protestant evangelism has been barred out of the Army, and of course it has no chance at the battle-ship: therefore, Rome and Militarism march together *toward Autocracy.*

A discouraged Georgia merchant writes me—

My Dear Sir: Just read your paper. Notice you printed petition for people to sign and forward to Congress, asking not to be sent across to Europe to be slaughtered, &c.

Do you know the people have given up everything that smacks of freedom?

We don't feel that there is use to do anything. Our manhood is gone, we feel like sheep waiting for the slaughter. What good is there in signing and mailing petitions to Congress?

Do they care to know the will of constituents? Or will they learn the will of "Higher Ups?" In fact, half the people—"fresh grown ups"—don't know or care what the Constitution says. The other half have given up the fight. We are now waiting to be offered up, and for what?

It seems to me that the Czar of Russia was badly treated.

So far as I ever heard, *he* hadn't legalized a Money Trust, financed a colossal Cotton gamble, destroyed a constitutional military system, demanded despotic power over prices, or insisted upon the gagging of public opinion.

The poor little Czar had not laid tremendous taxes upon the Russians, in order to show himself off as the lender of hundreds of millions of dollars to England, France, Italy, and Belgium.

Having had four years of Woodrow Wilson, I wonder how we would now enjoy a few years under Kaiser William.

I can't remember that this German autocrat ever taxed his own people, to get money to lend out to foreign nations.

It has escaped my fickle recollection, if the Kaiser ever ran his boot through the German constitution.

Did autocratic William ever smite, with his mailed fist, the reserved rights of the 25 German States?

I don't recall it.

Did the President have the constitutional authority to order the State militia into Mexico? He had not.

Did Congress have the constitutional authority to tax this country, to raise money to lend to Europe? It had not.

Has Congress the constitutional authority to adopt compulsory military service? It has not.

Has the Federal Government the power, under the Constitution, to raise armies by conscription? It has not.

That question was debated and settled, in the War of 1812, and it is therefore *res adjudicata.*

When Mr. Lincoln's administration was forced to resort to conscription during the third year of the Civil War, it was *a war measure*, like the suspension of *Habeas Corpus*, and the Emancipation of the slaves.

President Lincoln did not pretend that he was proceeding constitutionally.

In our day, we Democrats are so eager to be usurpers, that *we adopt a foreign war*, to get a chance to demolish the Constitution.

Don't you reckon Thomas Jefferson turned over in his grave. when Son-in-law McAdoo handed the British visitor that little check for $250,000,000, as a loan out of our taxes?

Don't you reckon Daniel Webster would have had a stroke of apoplexy, if President Andrew Jackson had proposed to lay taxes on the American people, to raise loans for England?

Don't you reckon Grover Cleveland would have had a fit, if he had been asked to tax America for foreign accommodation?

We first lend foreign nations hundreds of millions of dollars, because they snarled themselves into a universal tangle,

and then we propose to lend them hundreds of thousands of soldiers.

In other words, we do their banking and their fighting, just as though the War had been started by ourselves.

Our Government plays cat to the European monkey, and rakes chestnuts out of the fire, *for the monkey.*

And some folks call it *statesmanship!*

It didn't use to go by that name.

LITTLE NOTES ON THE GREAT WAR

In round numbers, the amount of money that Uncle Sam has loaned to foreign nations, is *five thousand millions of dollars.*

The North American States which declared themselves independent sovereigns, on July 4, 1776—and which were acknowledged to be such by Great Britain—afterwards met in convention, by State delegations, and created a Federal Government, *for specified purposes.*

These purposes were such as the States could not well deal with, separately, without conflicting laws, varying systems, and consequent confusion.

The States desired a Federal agency, or government, for the establishment of *uniformity* in our relations with foreign powers, *uniformity* in the currency system, the postal system, the commercial system, the naturalization of foreigners, the enactment of laws relating to commerce, and the raising of armies *to repel invasion, suppress insurrection, and enforce the laws of the Union.*

To enable the newly-created Federal agency, or government, to carry out the foregoing purposes—for which the sovereign States had voluntarily created it—the Federal Union was empowered to levy taxes directly upon the people, instead of calling upon the States for what was needed.

Realizing that these taxes would be insufficient, sometimes, the sovereign States authorized the Federal Union to borrow money.

Consult any constitutional lawyer, and he will tell you that the foregoing outline gives you substantially the truth about the origin and character of our Federal Government.

This being undeniable, you can readily see what a tremendous usurpation has been accomplished, when the Federal

Union takes from the people enormous sums of money, *to lend to foreign nations.*

Why didn't the Democratic party produce A Man, who would stand up in Congress, and fight this tremendous usurpation?

Because President Wilson calls himself a Democrat, and his own so-called Democrats cannot fight their Chief.

Why didn't the Republican party produce men enough to combat the usurpation?

Because the Republican party believes in a centralized Federal Government which usurps power, and tramples upon the States and the people.

Dmocracy, *the name*, hypnotizes the Democrats; while autocracy, *the thing*, charms the Republicans.

It's as it used to be with Prohibition, in Kansas: the Drys liked the situation, because they had the law; and the Wets liked it, because they had the liquor.

When Daniel Webster successfully opposed the conscription law of 1814, he illustrated his unanswerable argument by asking his brother Senators, whether the constitutional authority to borrow money could be distorted by the Government into a tyrannical power to *force a loan from the people.*

He argued that the Federal Government had no more legal right to force the citizen into the Army, than it had to force him to lend his money to the Government.

Can you answer the argument?

Can anybody do so?

Let one of our War-whoop dailies try it!

Mr. Webster's speech was made to the Senate on December 9, 1814. The weight of his reasoning was so great, that it killed the bill for conscription.

At that time, the country was in distress, because the War with England had lasted two years, and the Eastern States had refused to contribute troops.

Less than four months before Webster made his speech against conscription, the British had scattered our forces at Bladensburg, had looted and burned the public buildings of Washington City, and had chased President Madison into the Virginia backwoods.

Yet, Congress refused conscription, even under those trying circumstances. In other words, *Congress refused to become an odious, tyrannical* USURPER.

Congress relied upon the patriotic volunteer, and the volunteer did not fail his country in its hour of need.

Even as Daniel Webster spoke in the Senate, with the ruins of the British invasion all around him, the Southern volunteers, led by Andrew Jackson, were marshalling their rifles for the bloody victory of New Orleans, *won 30 days after Congress killed conscription.*

Why are the papers belittling the heroic volunteer, who used to be the subject of song and story, of the artist's brush and the sculptor's chisel?

Look at your great historic paintings, commemorating the triumphs of our War of Independence—who are the heroic figures painted there, for the admiration of all future generations?

They are volunteers!

Nobody conscripted George Washington, and Nathaniel Greene.

No act of Congress infused patriotic valor into Francis Marion, Israel Putnam, Dr. Warren, Col. Prescott, Harry Lee, Daniel Morgan, John Eagar Howard, John Sevier, Elijah Clark, David Twiggs, and sturdy old General Lincoln.

They were all volunteers.

How can we now sneer at the volunteer, ridicule him, and cartoon him, without defiling the monuments of Nathan Hale, of Gen. Sumter, of Paul Jones, of Commodore Perry, of the heroes of Lexington, of the patriots of King's Mountain?

God in Heaven! Some secret, subtle, sinister influence seems to be systematically at work, with diabolical art, *to change the whole American mind.*

The very things that used to be held in highest reverence, are now being defamed. The papers and cartoonists demean the very men and things that used to inspire the orator, the artist, the poet, and the historian.

How do you explain it?

The fact, is patent: what is the hidden *motive?*

General Lee was not a conscript: he was the volunteer commander of the finest army the world ever saw—*the volunteer Army of Northern Virginia!*

General Grant was not a conscript, nor were his best soldiers forced into the ranks: they were volunteers.

The Union troops conscripted in New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Chicago did not compare, in heroic earnestness, with the volunteers of the West, and the volunteers who left the Southern mountains to fight for the old flag.

Why should the Prussian militarists of today desecrate the graves of the volunteer patriots, of both sides, who gave their

lives at Manassas, at Shiloh, and in the Battles around Richmond?

It will be the worst of bad days, when the concealed movers of the puppet editors and puppet Congressmen succeed in convincing the American people, that the only respectable government is based upon the idea that the people have no intelligence, no patriotism, no spontaneous courage, but must be driven, by acts of legislation, into blind obedience to the united powers of Capitalism and Catholicism.

For you must be stone blind, if you do not see that the blackest agencies of the Roman church are desperately cooperating with incorporated, privileged, and aggressive Capitalism.

My words may carry no weight: I am only one little editor, of a small interior town, discredited by the Great, because I advocated, too soon, the measures they afterwards had to appropriate.

But while my words carry no weight, perhaps those of Daniel Webster may; and I will lay before you the gist of what he said against conscription, at a time when British troops were fighting on our own soil, when British ships were bombarding our forts, and when British wreckage strewed the public places of Washington City:

But, Sir, there is another consideration. **The services of the men to be raised under this act are not limited to those cases in which alone this government is entitled to the aid of the militia of the States. These cases are particularly stated in the Constitution—"to repel invasion, suppress insurrection, or execute the laws."** But this bill has no limitation in this respect.

This, then, Sir, is a bill for calling out the Miltia not according to its existing organization, but by draft from new created classes —not merely for the purpose of repelling invasion, suppressing insurrection, or executing the laws, but for the general objects of war.

What is this, Sir, but raising a standing army out of the Militia by draft, and to be recruited by draft, in like manner, as often as occasions require?

This bill, then, is not different in principle from the other bills, plans, and resolutions which I have mentioned. The present discussion is properly and necessarily common to them all. It is a discussion, Sir, of the last importance. **That measures of this nature should be debated at all, in the councils of a free government, is a cause of dismay. The question is nothing less than whether the most essential rights of personal liberty shall be surrendered, and despotism embraced in its worst form.**

I have risen, on this occasion, with anxious and painful emotions, to add my admonitions to what has been said by others. Admoni-

tion and remonstrance, I am aware, are not acceptable strains. They are duties of unpleasant performance.

I am anxious above all things, to stand acquitted before God, and my conscience, and in the public judgments, of all participation in the Counsels, which have brought us to our present condition and which now threaten the dissolution of the government. When the present generation of men shall be swept away and that this government ever existed shall be a matter of history only, I believe that it may then be known that you have not proceeded in your course unadmonished and unforewarned. Let it then be known that there were those, who would have stopped you, in the career of your measures, and hold you back, as by the skirts of your garments, from the precipice, over which you are plunging, and drawing after the government of your Country. . . .

Let us examine the nature and extent of the power which is assumed by the various military measures before us. In the present want of men and money, the Secretary of War has proposed to Congress a Military Conscription. For the conquest of Canada the people will not enlist, and if they would the treasury is exhausted and they could not be paid. Conscription is chosen as the most promising instrument, both of overcoming the reluctance to the Service, and of subduing the difficulties which arise from the deficiencies of the exchequer. The administration asserts the right to fill the ranks of the Regular Army by compulsion. It contends that it may now take one out of every twenty-five men, and any part or whole of the rest, whenever its occasions require. **Persons thus taken by force and put into an army may be compelled to serve there, during the war, or for life. They may be put on any service, at home or abroad, for defense or for invasion, according to the will and pleasure of the government.**

Is this, Sir, consistent with the character of a free government? Is this civil liberty? Is this the real character of our constitution? No, Sir, indeed it is not. The Constitution is libelled, foully libelled. **The people of this country have not established for themselves such a fabric of despotism. They have not purchased at a vast expense of their own treasures and their own blood a Magna Charta to be slaves.**

Where it is written in the Constitution, in what article or section is it contained that you **may take children from their parents and parents from their children and compel them to fight the battles of any war which the folly or the wickedness of government may engage it?** Under what concealment has this power lain hidden which now for the first time comes forth, with a tremendous and baleful aspect, **to trample down and destroy the dearest rights of personal liberty?** Who will show me any constitutional injunction which makes it the duty of the Amreican people to surrender everything valuable in life, and even life itself, **not when the safety of their country and its liberties may demand the sacrifice, but whenever the purposes of an ambitious and mischievous government may require it?**

Sir, I almost disdain to go to quotations and references to prove that **such an abominable doctrine has no foundation in the Constitution of the country.** It is enough to know that that instrument was intended as the basis of a free government, and that the power contended for is incompatible with any notion of personal

liberty. An attempt to maintain this doctrine upon the provisions of the Constitution is an exercise of perverse ingenuity to extract slavery from the substance of a free government. It is an attempt to show, by proof and argument, that we ourselves are subjects of despotism and that we have a right to chains and bondage, firmly secured to us and our children by the provisions of our government. It has been the labor of other men at other times, to mitigate and reform the powers of government by construction, to support the rights of personal security by every species of favorable and benign interpretation, and thus to infuse a free spirit into governments not friendly in their general structure and formation to public liberty.

The supporters of the measures before us act on the opposite principle. It is their task to raise arbitrary powers, by construction, out of a plain written charter of National Liberty. It is their pleasing duty to free us of the delusion, which we have fondly cherished, that we are the subjects of a mild, free, and limited government, and to demonstrate by a regular chain of premises and conclusions, that government possesses over us a power more tyrannical, more arbitrary, more dangerous, more allied to blood and murder, more full of every form of mischief, more productive of every sort of misery, than has been exercised by any civilized government, with one exception, in modern times.

Congress having, by the Constitution, a power to raise armies, the Secretary contends that no restraint is to be imposed on the exercise of this power, except such as is expressly stated in the written letter of the instrument. In other words, that Congress may execute its powers by any means it chooses, unless such means are particularly prohibited. But the general nature and object of the Constitution impose as rigid restriction on the means of exercising power as could be done by the most explicit injunctions. It is the first principle applicable to such a case, that no construction shall be admitted which impairs the general nature and character of the instrument. A free Constitution of government is to be construed upon free principles, and every branch of its provisions is to receive such an interpretation as is full of its general spirit. No means are to be takne by implication, which would strike us absurdly if expressed. And what would have been more absurd, than for this conbstitution to have said, that to secure the great blessings of liberty it gave to government an uncontrolled power of military conscription? Yet such is the absurdity which it is made to exhibit under the commentary of the Secretary of War.

A compulsory loan is not to be compared, in point of enormity, with a compulsory military service.

If the Secretary of War has proved the right of Congress to enact a law enforcing a draft of men out of the Militia into the regular Army, he will at any time be able to prove quite as clearly that Congress has power to create a Dictator. The arguments which have helped him in one case, will equally help him in the other. The same reason of a supposed or possible state necessity which is urged now, may be repeated then with equal pertinency and effect.

Sir, in granting Congress the power to raise armies, the People have granted all the means which are ordinary and usual, and which are consistent with the liberties and security of the People themselves, and they have granted no others. To talk about the unlimited power of the government over the means to execute its

authority, is to hold a language which is true only in regard to despotisms. The tyranny of Arbitrary Government consists as much in its means as in its ends, and it would be a ridiculous and absurd constitution which should be less cautious to guard against abuses in the one case than in the other. All the means and instruments which a free government exercises, as well as the ends and objects it pursues, are to partake of its own essential character, and to be conformed to its genuine spirit. **A free government, with arbitrary means to administer it, is a contradiction: a free government, without adequate provisions for personal security, is an absurdity: a free government with an uncontrolled power of military conscription is a solecism, at once the most ridiculous and abominable that ever entered into the head of man.**

Who shall describe to you the horror which your orders of Conscription shall create in the once happy villages of this country? Who shall describe the anguish and distress which they will spread over those hills and valleys, where men have, heretofore, been accustomed to labor and to rest in security and happiness. **Anticipate the scene, Sir, when the class shall assemble to stand its draft and to throw the dice for blood.** What a group of wives and mothers and sisters, of helpless age and helpless infancy, shall gather round the theatre of this horrible lottery, as if the strokes of death were to fall from heaven before their eyes, on a father, a son, or a husband. And in the majority of cases, Sir, it will be a stroke of death. Under present prospects of a continuance of the war, not one-half of them on whom your conscription shall fall, will ever return to tell the tale of their sufferings.

They will perish of disease and pestilence, or they will leave their bones to whiten in fields beyond the frontier. Does the lot fall on the father of a family? His children, already orphans, shall see his face no more. When they behold him for the last time they shall see him lashed and fettered, and dragged away from his own threshold, like a felon and an outlaw. Does it fall on a son, the hope and staff of aged parents? That hope shall fail them. On that staff they shall lean no longer. They shall not enjoy the happiness of dying before their children. They shall totter to their graves, bereft of their offspring, and unwept by any who inherit their blood. Does it fall on a husband? The eyes which watch his parting steps may swim in tears forever. She is a wife no longer. There is no relation so tender or so sacred, that, by these accursed measures, you do not propose to violate it. Into the paradise of domestic life you enter, not indeed by temptations and sorceries, but by open force and violence. * * *

Nor is it, Sir, for the defense of his own house and home that he is subject to military draft is to perform the task allotted to him. * * *

Thus spoke the greatest constitutional lawyer this country ever produced. *His argument killed the conscription bill.*

He asserted, with statesmanly foresight and wisdom, that the same usurped powers which create an Army *by conscription*, could with equal ease create *a Dictator.*

Hasn't this Congress carried, in one hand, a Conscription bill, and, in the other, a bill to give the President the unlimited

authority to gag the press and fix the prices of all commodities?

Isn't that the same as vesting him with the despotic power of a Dictator?

No king that ever lived wielded more autocratic control than President Wilson has demanded!

The European War has already intimidated free speech, and made the average citizen *afraid to sign a Petition to the Government*, although the U. S. Constitution guarantees him that right, forever.

The War has also furnished the enemies of free press with the excuse for giving the Postmatser-General *autocratic power to rule papers and magazines out of the mails*, thus taking away a man's property without any proceeding in court, and robbing him arbitrarily of one of the most valuable rights of citizenship.

The wise Frenchman, De Tocqueville, who wrote a great book, a hundred years ago, on "Democracy in America," said—

In countries where the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people prevails, the censorship of the press is not only dangerous, but absurd. When the right of every citizen to a share in the government or society is acknowledged, every one must be presumed to be able to choose between the various opinions of his contemporaries, and to appreciate the different facts from which inferences may be drawn. The sovereignty of the people and the liberty of the press may therefore be regarded as correlative; just as the censorship of the press and universal suffrage are two things which are irreconcilably opposed, and which cannot long be retained among the institutions of the same people.

Even the abuses of the press must be tolerated. Tracing the steps possible in any attempt to repress them, he concludes:

And now you have succeeded, everybody is reduced to silence. But your object was to repress the abuses of liberty, and you are brought to the feet of a despot. You have been led from the extreme of independence to the extreme of servitude, without finding a single tenable position on the way at which you could stop.

Anonymous letters warn me against expressing a free man's opinions against conscription, against Wilsonian autocracy, and against Prussian militarism *which is being introduced under the mask of democracy.*

Do these anonymous warners mean to say, that I am not to exercise as much freedom of speech as Benj. H. Hill did,

when he spoke in Atlanta against Federal usurpations, during the evil days of Reconstruction?

Are we to be railroaded into a Capitallistic-Catholic despotism, without even the privilege of a protest?

It seems that the volunteer patriots of 1776 were a deluded lot of lunatics; and that the heroes of the Protestant Reformation were guilty of a heinous crime in revolting against Papalism.

Volunteer patriotism is now a mockery and a byeword; while a Protestant who dares to protest against the steady encroachments of modern popery, is a traitor whose mouth must be closed by an arrest, or whose publication must be thrown out of the mails.

After having paid their visit to the President, some members of the British Commission, which came over to stimulate us to answer the British cry for "Help," motored down to Baltimore, to pay their respect to the American General of the Jesuits.

Prince James Gibbons received his English courtiers, with urbane graciosity, wined and dined them in his palace, and sent them back to Washington chortling with satisfaction.

What has England ever done for us, that we should now do so much for her? And what has Gibbons got to do with it?

The daily War-Whoops, and Semi-weekly War-Dances, and weekly Steam-whistles all tell us that we never before faced such a crisis.

Who made this crisis?

What interests worked it up?

Why did the British Commissioners make such a point of quickly conferring with Cardinal Gibbons?

Bless goodness! we've been at war with Germany for more than three months, and Germany hasn't paid the slightest attention to us.

Germany goes right along fighting on the same old battlefield, burning a few hundred thousand slain enemies, and making soap-grease out of the others, and she doesn't seem to know or care what sort of monkey doings *we* are up to.

Germany *won't* come over and fight *us;* and therefore we will go over, and fight *her.*

To cross a pond 3,000 miles wide, hunting for trouble, is one way to bring on a "crisis."

"Never before have we had such a crisis"—say the daily War-Whoops and the weekly War-Dances. No, indeed: never before did we travel into foreign lands, *hunting for one.*

Son-in-law McAdoo is almost becoming irritated, over the failure of the people to invest in his preliminary bond-issue of *two thousand millions of dollars.*

By the time the average man pays for something to eat, and something to wear—and his rent, road-tax, poll-tax, school-book bills, and a few other little sky-high necessaries —he is not "so situated" that he can lend the Government two thousand million dollars.

Speaking for the Southern States, I can say, that Brother McAdoo helped the Speculators skin us so artistically; on 6-cent cotton, that we haven't had much loose change in our pockets since.

It's all we can do to pay 10 cents apiece for biscuits, 25 cents for hoecakes, and 20 cents a pound for sow-belly.

When Brother McAdoo loaned the Speculator $30 to buy our bale of cotton with, and then handed the same Speculator an Insurance policy of $70 on the same bale, we got a bitter taste in our mouths, and it's there yet.

We are just human; and we thought it an infernal outrage *for the Government to make itself a party to a gamble*, in which the farmer was victimized, *directly*, to the extent of four hundred million dollars, inside of three months.

A subscriber asks me to tell the people how to lawfully get out of conscription.

There is but one way: *test the matter in the courts.*

I cannot afford to imitate Bishop Keiley's method. This Roman prelate—*sworn subject of a foreign ruler*—tried a Georgia statute in his own mind, *by the medieval law of his foreign sovereign*, and pronounced the Georgia statute invalid.

He follows up this treasonous conduct, by defying the State, *setting himself above the Courts*, and ordering his women to resist the grand jury in the performance of its legal duty.

Not being the sworn subject of a foreign potentate, I cannot indulge in the luxury of setting myself above the law, or of advising others to do so.

Any father, or mother, whose son is about to be conscripted, or who has been conscripted, can lawfully stop the proceedings by applying to a Judge—either State or Federal—for an Injunction, or for the writ of *Habeas Corpus*, according to the status of the case.

This was done in Washington City when the Government was about to take a minor, *who had volunteered*, and send him to Mexico, against the will of his parents.

Of course. any man who has been conscripted, or who is

threatened with conscription, can also apply to the Courts for relief.

Congress cannot give the President greater powers than the Constitution gives to Congress.

Test this new law, in a lawful way, *by an appeal to the old Supreme Law.*

If the new law, made by the Congress of 1917, violates the old Supreme Law, made by the Constitutional Convention of 1787, the Judges will so hold, and will set it aside, *presumably.*

I cannot understand the paralysis which prostrates our people, and causes them to supinely give up their own flesh and blood to new fangled statutes of Congressional *usurpers.*

The States, in creating the Federal Government, did not give to Congress the authority to raise an Army by *compulsion.*

The States possess the sovereign right to create a militia, and this militia was put at the disposal of the Federal Government for *three purposes*, ONLY.

The States, speaking through their delegates in the Congressional Convention of 1787, said, that the new proposed Federal Union could call upon the States for their militia and use it, for the repelling of an invasion, the suppression of an insurrection, and the execution of the laws.

Heretofore, the standing Army has been filled by volunteer enlistments: it is now the law, under the recent Act of Congress, that the standing Army shall henceforth be filled by forcible selection of the best available men.

The law is unconstitutional. It is an arbitrary act of usurpation.

English liberties were made good against the tyranny of hereditary kings, by leaders who resisted encroachments upon their persons and their purses.

American liberties are in danger of being lost, because we have no leaders to resist governmental encroachments.

Previous to the War between the States, political education was maintained by public discussions of great principles, by great men.

Since the War, political education has been neglected; and the people who once knew that they were sovereigns, with ample power to control their public affairs, now act upon the idea that they are subjects, without the liberty of doing anything, except to pay taxes, and obey the orders of those in office.

In the *American Forum*, Cardinal Gibbons — who never fails to let the Catholics know how the Italian pope wants

them to vote—published a card in favor of universal compulsory military service.

What reason did this tricky old Jesuit, professed representative of the Prince of Peace, give for his warlike utterances?

He declared that compulsory service will instill into our young men "the spirit of obedience: it will teach them the dignity of obedience . . . as an homage rendered to God, since they will consider *their superiors*, God's representatives."

Precisely: there's the papal idea!

Let all power be held *above* the people: let them understand that their *superiors* are God's representatives: let them pay all expenses, and obey all orders, being happy in the faith of bliss in the life to come.

The American idea has been different, but is rapidly changing.

Our idea has been, that *the people* are the source of power, and that public officials are public servants, responsible to their sovereign masters, *the people.*

According to the Baltimore Papal Prince—who *never* misses an opportunity to put the Italian pope into our politics —President Wilson is not the servant of a sovereign commonwealth, but is the Divine Right ruler, chosen by God.

American citizens must not henceforth use their own minds, and act upon their own convictions, but must meekly obey every order coming from those in authority; and if those orders do violence to the conscientious opinions of the citizen, he must render obedience "as an homage rendered to God."

That's what Popery taught, after it had effected the union of Church and State in the Roman Empire, and that's what brought the Dark Ages upon Europe.

Those Dark Ages lasted a thousand years. During those black and bloody centuries, there was no education for the masses, no preaching to the congregations, no Bible they could read, no libraries accessible to the common man; and no liberties, such as the ancients had enjoyed, before the Roman bishops became monsters of ambition, avarice, lust, and tyranny.

During those Dark Ages, the voice of the Roman church was exactly the same as that of the foxy old Jesuit, Cardinal Gibbons.

The Princes of the Church then said, as they now do, that authority is from God, not from the people, and that it is homage to God to meekly obey those who are in authority.

It was against this monstrous doctrine, that the more inde-

pendent Catholics at last had to revolt: it had become too oppressive for humanity to bear.

The revolt of the Catholic barons of England wrung, from a kingly vassal of the Italian pope, the Great Charter of our liberties; *and the Italian pope pronounced the bitter curse of Rome upon that Charter.*

GIBBONS HATES IT, NOW, *just as it was hated by Pope Innocent III., when he laid his satanic curse upon its glorious principles.*

The amazing thing to me is, that our people do not appear to realize that the reactionary principles of medieval absolutism, Divine Right, One-man power, are being systematically substituted for those progressive principles of popular self-government, for which so many millions of our great white race worked, suffered, wrote, preached, organized, fought, and died.

The old foes of humanity are coming back.

The old battles will have to be re-fought.

The children forgot what their fathers told them: *their* sons will bear the burden, and pay the penalty.

There is a post-card picture that you may have seen, representing an Indian, out on the snow-covered plains of the Northwest, leaning against a telegraph pole, listening—with a face which expresses awe, curiosity, bewilderment, *and fear*—to the humming of the wires overhead.

The name of the picture is, "The Song of the Talking Wire."

My friends and countrymen, let me tell you a terrible truth—

You and I know as little about what's going on, behind the scenes of Governmental action, at this time, as that Indian knew about the messages going over those wires!

THE GREAT WAR, PRUSSIAN MILITARISM AND THE RECONSTRUCTION OF MODERN CIVILIZATION

When a nation or a city is alarmed by the approach of epidemic disease, what course is adopted?

Do the authorities send out a large number of healthy citizens to catch the infection and bring it into the alarmed community, or do they quarantine against it?

If the authorities should open the way for the entrance of the plague, they would be considered insane, and if they should send forth large numbers of sound men to contract the pestilence and bring it in, they would be considered criminal.

Now consider this foreign horror which goes by the name of Prussian militarism: what is the best way to treat it?

Should we shut it out, or should we send a million men to catch it?

As long as Prussian militarism stays in Prussia, its none of our business.

If that is what the Germans like, let them have it.

We have not discussed the existence of autocracy in Japan: we have not bothered our heads about autocracy in Spain: we made no protest against the autocracy of Russia.

Why have we suddenly become responsible for the universe?

To show you how wildly vague are the prevailing notions about our embarking upon the European War, I will quote the preamble to Dr. Gambrell's resolution adopted by the Southern Baptist Convention, a few days ago:

> The Southern Baptist Convention, assembled in the City of New Orleans, May 19th, 1917, representing the views commonly held by the Baptists everywhere—contemplating with mingled feelings of sorrow and hope the conflict of the great nations, **which we recognize as a struggle of militarism, autocracy and special privilege against the simple, fundamental, indefeasible and inalienable human rights.**

Can you imagine a more indefinite declaration, as to the purposes which drag us into the quicksands?

Is "autocracy" confined to any one nation? Is special privilege a European monopoly? Is militarism a local curse?

It is a most lamentable fact, that there isn't a government on earth which is not afflicted with one or the other of these evils; and anyone who knows about the land monopoly in

England, the special privileges of American manufacturers, and the militarism even of Switzerland, will read with astonishment Dr. Gambrell's statement, that we are going to cross an ocean 3,000 miles wide, in order that we may help—with blood and treasure—crush militarism in Germany.

The Gambrell resolution further declared, as to our aim in the War:

> We insist that in the reconstruction of modern civilization now going on that the President of the United States and his counsellors, whom Providence has thrust into the leadership of advancing civilization shall, in the final adjustment of the issues involved, see to it that everywhere religious persecutions shall cease, that preaching and the exercise of religion shall be free to every human soul.

I give the above because it fairly represents current opinion.

Dr. Gambrell spoke for his resolution, and was vigorously applauded. His resolutions were enthusiastically adopted, and they were published as the official voice of nearly three million white Baptists.

Is a "reconstruction of modern civilization now going on"?

Did the Almighty thrust President Wilson into a second term?

When I hear a minister of the Gospel, talking to a great gathering of brother ministers, and telling them, in effect, that God elected to have seven million soldiers slain, and seven million homes desolated, as a preliminary to a "reconstruction of modern civilization," I confess my inability to understand that conception of God and of religion.

Not one of those private soldiers was in the least responsible for autocracy, special privilege, or militarism.

Those who *were* responsible are still alive, occupying the high seats in life.

If Christian civilization needed "reconstruction," after the religion of Christ had been supreme for 1,000 years, who was at fault?

Never have I known the churches to wage bloodless but earnest wars against autocracy, special privilege, and militarism.

On the contrary, the organized clergy of the churches have given zealous support to established autocracy, special privilege, and militarism.

And they are doing it now.

But the point I want to make clear to my readers is this—

Prussian militarism cannot harm us, unless we plant it in our soil.

The English sparrow was never an American pest until the Government imported a few pairs, and built boxes for them to nest in.

The English hare never became a national affliction in Australia, until some deluded person imported a few pairs to that new country.

Asiatic cholera never comes into Europe and America, until some traveller brings it.

How can Prussian militarism be imported and planted in the United States?

If *the idea* once takes possession of our military men, who can keep them from planting it?

That the idea has long been fixed in the minds of our military men, no one can deny.

They have admired the German system, and considered it the climax of military excellence.

The quick and brilliant victories that Prussia gained over Denmark, Austria, and France, caused the whole military world to study German drill, German arms, German tactics, and German compulsory service.

This was natural. Every man with a trade or profession, reads and thinks with especial reference to that trade or profession.

If he is a progressive, ambitious man, he wants to improve his trade, or profession.

When Germany produced her new needle-gun, in 1866, the military world discarded the old muzzle-loaders.

I cite this, as a familiar fact; and it illustrates my proposition, namely—that German successes caused the military class to study and imitate German methods.

This being so, Prussian militarism has long been a fixed idea in the heads of American military officers.

From the General Staff at Washington City, that idea has permeated the whole military system. From that source, has come the propositions which overthrow the American system and establish the German.

The American system embodied in the U. S. Constitution is based primarily upon State militia, to be called into national service when needed to repel invasion, suppress insurrection, or overcome resistance to the laws.

Mr. Webster set this forth with absolute clearness in the great argument from which I quoted last week.

But the virtual abolition of the States, as enrollers of volunteers, to be handed over to the general Government when legally requisitioned; the substitution of a national conscript

system which enables the Government to press into service the citizens of the States; the scornful disregard of Governors and the arbitrary subjection of the citizen to military use, either at home or abroad—all this constitutes a new system, and its essence is *Prussian.*

Thus *the idea of the thing*, which has long been in the minds of our military men, has at last produced *the thing itself.*

Therefore when Dr. Gambrell, or any one else, talks about our going to war against *militarism*, he might as well talk about the old woman who went to hunt for her spectacles when she had them on her head.

I was a member of Congress at the time General Cutting, of California, first introduced one of those revolutionary Prussian bills. It was about to pass without attracting attention, because General Cutting suavely assured the House that it was nothing more than a necessary modernizing of the State militia.

However, I read the bill and saw that it proposed a revolution by robbing the Governors of the control of State troops, and vesting supreme control in the President.

In my speech, it was my good fortune to secure the attention of Gen. William C. Oates, of Alabama, one of the Democratic wheel-horses.

He promptly came to my assistance, and the bill was defeated.

It came back afterwards in another Congress, and neither Gen. Oates nor I was there to fight it.

Under the name of the Dick bill, it became the origin of our present "militarism," which Dr. Gambrell believes we will wipe out when we invade Europe.

Nothing that I can say or do pleases some people, and these are now saying that I favored the war until President Wilson came to that view.

Readers of this paper know better. They know that I earnestly favored the dismissal of the German ambassador, immediately after the *Lusitania* massacre; and also the seizure of the alien Turks, Bulgarians, Austrians, and Germans, *as hostages.*

Not a line in this paper ever indicated that I favored conscription, or the sending of conscripts to France, or the creation of dictatorial powers for the President.

That our fleet should take a hand in the fight for neutral rights on the high seas, I believed and said; but I never even

dreamed of the possibility of a vast conscription of our young men for land-service, and in Europe.

My position has been perfectly consistent; and it might be likened to that of a farmer who prays for rain, but doesn't want a deluge that will ruin his crops and take off most of his soil.

I am not "too proud to fight," as the President said he was, but I am too conservative to leave the New World and go hunting for a fight in the Old World.

The German fleet is bottled up, and the U-boats have proved to be more exasperating than effective; consequently, I cannot see why our magnificent navy is unable to protect our neutral rights on the ocean.

Hon. Charles H. Brand, of Georgia, expressed the views of a large percentage of the people in his speech in Congress, April 28, 1917. He said—

The full war strength of the National Guard is about 287,000 soldiers. The full war strength of the Regular Army is about 625,000 soldiers. Here is a provision of law already in existence, approved by the Army and the President, for raising an army of nearly 1,000,000, all that the President is now calling for, and it is my honest judgment that this million men should be raised in this way before resorting to conscription. The volunteer system has been approved by the President in the past. The truth is no English-speaking country on the face of the earth has ever drafted its citizens at the beginning of a war. No country on earth which ever went to war has failed first to call for volunteer enlistments. No country in Europe has any conscript law whereby soldiers may be sent across the seas to engage in a war except by special authority first being granted by its legislative body.

Besides, all the wars that this country has ever engaged in or ever won were won by volunteer soldiers. No European country, so far as I know, ever resorted at the beginning of a war to conscription to raise an army. It is currently reported in Washington that some of the Army officers were themselves opposed to conscription and were in favor of giving the volunteer system a trial before resorting to conscription.

Maj. W. C. Harllee, of the United States Marine Corps, who has served in that branch for 17 years, in testifying before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, said:

Unwilling men burden armies, eat its substance, retard its action, and give it panic. I am opposed to universal service or compulsory service, or any other kind of service than that rendered by willing men.

Some well-informed people in Congress charge that the conscription scheme is a pet of the General Staff of the Army, and that the War College finally persuaded the President to give it his approval.

The President and Secretary of War Garrison differed upon this very subject, which difference resulted in the latter's resigning from

the Cabinet. On February 10, 1916, the President wrote Secretary Garrison, in part, as follows:

"As I have had occasion to say to you, I am not yet convinced that the measure of preparation for national defense which we deem necessary can be obtained through the instrumentality of the National Guard under Federal control and training. **As you know, I do not at all agree with you in favoring compulsory enlistment for training, and I fear the advocacy of compulsion before the committee of the House, on the part of the representatives of the Department of War, has greatly prejudiced the House against the proposal for a continental army, little necessary connection as there is between the plan and the opinion of the Chief of Stafff on compulsory enlistment."**

On Memorial Day the President made a speech at Arlington, in which he made this statement:

"I have heard a great many people talk about universal training. Universal voluntary training with all my heart if you wish it, but America does not wish anything but compulsion of the spirit of America."

Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to his friend John Adams, expressed himself on conscription as follows:

"In Virginia draft was ever the most unpopular and impracticable thing that could be attempted, our people even under monarchial government had learned to consider it as the last of all oppressions."

Now, if you are disposed to treat me fairly, you will see that Congressman Brand, without intending to do it, proved in Congress that my present position against conscription, not only accords with that of Thomas Jefferson, but with the opinions of President Wilson, as expressed by him a year ago.

It is the President who has changed, not I.

Secretary Garrison resigned because the President's position in February, 1916, was exactly the same as mine.

People should remember that not only did President Wilson oppose conscription in February, 1916, and virtually put Mr. Garrison out of the Cabinet because Garrison favored it, but late in December of last year, *President Wilson attempted to act as peacemaker among the belligerents.*

Suppose that his effort had been successful, what would he have done about all those preceding German atrocities, on account of which he now proposes to draft an army for service beyond the seas?

What was it that so totally changed his mind after the last days of December, when he saw nothing to cause us to take part in the European fighting?

Congressman Brand further said—

Conscription has never yet made a good soldier of a man who was opposed to war.

Legislative authority to conscript men does not supply patriotism and bravery when it is lacking.

You can not make a fighter of anyone by legislation.

The truth is that the volunteer system has become, by reason of use and age and the long recognition of the wisdom of its adoption by the people of our country, the law of the land. The volunteer system is the rule of raising an army by all the nations of the earth. Conscription is the exception, and when the exception is invoked a case of stern necessity and grave national peril should exist.

For the life of me I can not see at present any necessity, excuse or reason for sending an army of our boys against their will to Europe, as is contemplated to be done in the Army bill.

And yet the Army officers and the War College are bent on having an army of boys under 20 years of age. Hon. John Temple Graves, in an article in the New York American, over his own signature, stated that the chairman of the War College told him if the bill passed it was their intention to organize an army of 500,000 men under 20 years of age. Bear in mind that they propose to conscript them to make up this great army. Unless a greater menace and necessity, and a more portentious peril than now appears should require it, I will never by my vote indorse such a monstrous proposition.

My view is that if the administration thinks it necessary to send an army to Europe at this time that it should be composed of those, and only those, who are willing to go.

In my judgment it is unwise to send an army to Europe at this time, whether composed of volunteers or conscripts; but to me this is immaterial if those only are sent who are willing to go.

These are some of the reasons which compel me to vote to give the volunteer system a trial.

In addition to these, the Army bill, which we are peremptorily demanded to vote for, is objectionable to me for several reasons, though by adopting amendment after amendment in the committee room and which we hope will be done on the floor of the House much of its sting and fangs will be removed.

The War College or Army bill contemplated that a military board composed only of Army officers should pass on who should go to the trenches and who should remain at home under the select conscription plan, while the committee bill provided that a majority of this board should be composed of civilians, and home people at that.

Under the Army bill the exempting officer representing the Government, whoever he may be, will decide who will go to war and who shall stay at home. This officer has the life, liberty, and freedom of every man drawn under his direction and control. He and those under him will decide who shall go to war and who shall remain at home. He can take a white man after being drawn from the box and leave a negro, and vice versa. In effect, one's liberty and freedom is in the hands of this officer the minute his name is drawn from the box.

The Army bill does not provide, as many believe, for the exemption of married men. It does not necessarily follow that because a man is married that he will not be sent to the war. Unless his family is absolutely dependent upon him—and the exempting officer is to be the judge of this—he will be given his marching roders.

In my judgment this Army bill, if enacted as proposed, means the beginning in this country in times of peace of a regular standing army. It means universal compulsory military service, and nothing short of it. A regular standing army in times of peace is contrary to all the cherished ideals of this great Republic, and repugnant to American institutions and democratic traditions. We should be careful lest in attempting to destroy militarism and autocracy abroad we will do those things which will have a tendency to destroy democracy at home. A great standing army in America involves the establishment of a military caste which is socially superior to any other caste and which is not amenable to the rules of conduct laid down for the civilian members of society. It discriminates between the walks of life, between the Army officer and the soldier and the plain citizen in civil life.

The Americans who love their sons, and don't want them forced into the European war, have just as much right to test the constitutionality of the new law *which demands blood*, as the Americans who loved their dollars, and didn't want to pay the income tax of 1893, had to combat that law.

Those Northern millionaires did not pay their income taxes, pending the test of the law. They got an injunction which restrained the Government from collecting the tax.

Then when the U. S. Supreme Court declared the law unconstitutional, the law was treated as a dead letter.

The people have a perfect right to peaceably organize for the purpose of securing legal services; and if the Judge to whom their attorney applies grants the restraining order, the conscription stops in that case, until the court decides the question.

When Congress, in obedience to the U. S. Constitution, enacted a Fugitive Slave law, the courts in the Eastern and Northern States issued writs of *Habeas Corpus*, applied for in behalf of the negro runaways.

Will the courts now refuse to white men what they formerly granted to the blacks?

When Congress, or the States, pass laws which the railroads do not consider constitutional, the courts readily issue injunctions, staying the law until the question of constitutionality can be settled.

Will the courts deny to natural citizens that which they grant to artificial?

In other words, is there a remedy for dollars and none for lives?

It would be a preposterous proposition to assert, that the U. S. Courts can legally negative congressional usurpations which confiscate profits, but are powerless to negative usurpations which practically confiscate lives.

If the U. S. Supreme Court has any higher mission than the preservation of the Constitution, what is it?

And if the citizen cannot appeal to the courts against arbitrary infractions of his guaranteed constitutional liberties, then those liberties are already lost.

Do we not remember, that President Wilson's peace note of December last was considered so likely to end the War, that speculators gambled on it?

There were huge fortunes made, it was said, by those who had inside information of the note, and the scandal became so great that Congress went through the form of investigating the "leakage."

There were accusations which implicated some very high people indeed, close to the President; but the only point I make on it now is, that *President Wilson wanted to make peace with German "autocracy" and German atrocities*, SIX MONTHS AGO!

What has happened since, to throw all the fat in the fire?

In the Atlanta Constitution of January 1, 1917, a front-page headline ran—

"*Hope is dwindling that Wilson note will hasten peace.*"

"*Wilson is expected to send another note.*"

Therefore, the actual facts are, that in January our Government was still eager to bring about peace, leaving German autocracy enthroned, and leaving the *Lusitania* unavenged.

WHAT HAPPENED AFTERWARDS?

Consider another extremely important and undeniable fact:

On January 7th of this year, our ambassador to Germany, Hon. James W. Gerard, was guest of honor at a grand banquet in Berlin, where the high officials of the German government were invited guests, and where several speeches were made expressive of the cordial friendship existing between the German government and that of the United States.

Think of it! In January of this year, five months ago, when German autocracy was as autocratic as possible, and all the atrocities for which we now go to war had long since been committed.

Remember, that Mr. Gerard had just returned to Berlin from a visit to this country, during which he had confidential personal interviews with President Wilson.

I consider this Berlin incident so very significant, in view of what has happened since, that I will give it to you in full as it appears in the Galveston Daily News of Jan. 8, 1917:

Berlin, by Wireless to Sayville, Jan. 7.—A large number of the leading personages of Germany, says the Overseas News Agency, were present at the dinner given last night in honor of James W.

Gerard, the American ambassador to Germany, by the American Association of Commerce and Trade of Berlin. The diners were addressed by Ambassador Gerard, Vice Chancellor Helfferich, Foreign Secretary Zimmermann and Arthur von Gwynner, the director of the Deutsche Bank, and in all the speeches the cordial relationship existing between the governments of the United States and Germany were emphasized. Ambassador Gerard, who was likened by Director von Gwynner to "the peace dove of Noah's ark," is quoted by the Overseas News Agency as saying that "never since the beginning of the war have relations between Germany and the United States been so cordial," and that he had "brought back an olive branch" from President Wilson.

Vice Chancellor Helfferich said he was pleased to know that Ambassador Gerard had visited the United States, "where he had an opportunity of describing the real state of affairs in Germany," and Foreign Minister Zimmermann declared he "felt sure the friendly relations between both the United States and Germany, as enunciated by Mr. Gerard, will continue."

Telegrams to President and Kaiser.

A telegram expressing the "sincerest wishes" of the association "in this crucial time" was forwarded to President Wilson, and another message was forwarded to Emperor William.

Dr. Helferrich, in his speech, as quoted by the Overseas News Agency, called attention to the increase in commerce between Germany and the United States, saying that in the ten years from 1903 to 1913 it had increased by more than one billion marks. The Overseas News Agency continues:

"Arthur von Gwynner, director of the Deutsche Banks, compared Ambassador Gerard with the peace dove of Noah's ark, on the return of which Noah realized that he had sent it out too early, but, nevertheless, he had seen the colors of the rainbow.

"Ambassador Gerard, in his speech, told of the sympathy in the United States for Germany's charity work. Many prominent people had handed him checks for the German Red Cross. On his return to Germany, he said, he had delivered to the different German relief funds about 400,000 marks. Continuing, Mr. Gerard said:

Relations Never Better.

" 'Never since the beginning of the war have the relations between Germany and the United States been so cordial as now. I have brought back an olive branch from the president—or don't you consider the president's message an olive branch?

" 'I personally am convinced that as long as Germany's fate is directed by such men as my friend, the chancellor, and Dr. Helferrich and Dr. Solt; by Admirals von Capelle (minister of the navy), Holtzendorff (head of the naval general staff), and von Mueller (naval adviser to the emperor); by Generals von Hindenburg (chief of the general staff), and Ludenorff (first quartermaster general), and last, but not least, by my friend Zimmermann, the relations between the two countries are running no risk.'

"Toward the end of the evening Dr. Zimmermann, who had been attending a conference with the Austro-Hungarian foreign minister, Count Czzernin von Chudenitz, appeared at the banquet. Addressing the guests, the German foreign secretary pointed out that a large

number of persons had supposed that Ambassador would not return to this country of barbarians, but that he had been sure the ambassador would return in good health and with good intentions.

Relations Always Pleasant.

"Continuing, Dr. Zimmermann said:

" 'I always collaborated with Mr. Ambassador in excellent manner and with mutual confidence, so that I feel sure that the friendly and trustful relations between both countries will continue in the way expressed by Mr. Gerard.'

"The American Association sent telegrams to Emperor William and President Wilson. The telegram to the president reads:

" 'The American Association or Commerce and Trade of Berlin is giving a dinner to Ambassador Gerard, and, honored by the presence of leaders in German politics, commerce and industry, it wishes to express to the president of the United States its sincerest wishes in these crucial times.' "

WAR QUESTIONS AND WAR ISSUES. LET US REASON TOGETHER. JUDGE THE NEW LAWS BY THE SUPREME LAW

As everybody knows, the American colonists waged a war of seven years to establish the principle, that the Englishmen who colonized the New World brought with them, and were entitled to enjoy, *the rights of Englishmen*, as defined by the laws of the Mother Country?

Is it not so?

Look again at the celebrated set of resolutions which Patrick Henry wrote on a blank leaf of his Blackstone, presented to the Virginia House of Burgesses, and advocated in his immortal speech.

The spirit of the colonial revolt was, that the colonists were English, and could not be arbitrarily deprived of the fundamental rights of Englishmen.

Again I ask, IS IT NOT SO?

Of course your mind will at once single out the principle of "No taxation without representation"; but this principle was only one of many.

Among the rights of Englishmen, claimed by the colonists, were those of trial by jury, freedom of speech and press, the sacredness of the home from searches without a warrant; the full enjoyment of personal liberty, of life, and of property; the right to keep and bear arms; the right to peacefully as-

semble; and the right to petition the government against existing or threatened wrongs.

One of the most important, most ancient, and best established principles of personal liberty in England was, *that no Englishman could be sent out of the realm without his own consent.*

Sir William Blackstone, discussing this great fundamental principle in his *Commentaries*—the text-book of legal students throughout the English-speaking world — uses very strong language.

In paragraph 137, of Book I., the learned jurist says, that "*No power on earth . . . . . can send any subject of England out of the land against his will;* NO, NOT EVEN A CRIMINAL!"

The words omitted by me from the line are, "except the authority of Parliament," and I omitted them because, in England, the Parliament was—and is—omnipotent, *not limited by any written Constitution.*

The King himself, even in the most arbitrary Tudor days, could not lawfully compel an Englishman to leave England. The royal power could restrain a man from *going away*, but could not send him away.

In those days, soldiers and sailors were *voluntary hirelings.* There was no conscription.

Even during the long, long years of the Napoleonic Wars, lasting for nearly a quarter of a century, *Great Britain never conscripted a single soldier.*

Wellington's victories were the work of volunteers. The French were driven out of Portugal and Spain by volunteers. The victors at Waterloo were volunteers.

The immortal Six Hundred at the Battle of Balaclava, were volunteers.

The conquerors of India, of the Soudan, of Egypt, and of South Africa, were volunteers.

The four million Englishmen, Canadians, and Australians who have saved France and England from the conscripted hordes of ruthless Huns, are gallant, patriotic *volunteers.*

England has not sent one single conscript to the battle-line!

England now has a conscript law, forced upon her by the treason of Catholic priests in Ireland and Canada.

Those traitorous allies of the Pope and Kaiser, preached treason so effectively to the Catholic French Canadians, and to the Catholic Irish, that these poor priest-ridden dupes refused to enlist and fight for the salvation of their country.

From the very beginning of the Great War, this persistent treason of the Catholic priesthood has been the source of England's weakness.

It was aggravated by the conduct of the Catholic Treason-Societies in America, which sent money, arms, and recruits to aid the Germans in their attempted Irish rebellion.

Some of the American Catholics were caught red-handed, and were justly condemned to be shot; but Cardinal Gibbons, Tumulty, Tammany & Co., prevailed upon our Government to intervene and save the condemned traitors, just as the same influences prevailed upon the Government to save the traitor priests condemned by Carranza.

The defection of the Catholics of Ireland and Canada forced Parliament to exercise its unlimited power, and to do a thing which no English government has ever done since the Feudal Ages.

Queen Elizabeth never conscripted a soldier or a sailor, although Spain's army threatened from Holland, and Spain's Invincible Armada was sailing up the Channel.

The volunteers rallied to the country's defense, and saved it.

During the long wars that England waged against the French King, Louis XIV., no law of conscription existed.

The greatest statesmen our race ever produced—men like Walpole, Chatham, Pitt, Fox, Canning, Peel, Gladstone, and D'Israeli—directed England's destinies in world-wide wars, never lost a single one of them (excepting our Revolutionary War), and never once resorted to compulsory military service.

Even when Napoleon had massed his victorious legions at Boulogne to invade England, and the whole of Europe almost held its breath in suspense, England never lost her nerve, and never *forced* a single man to the colors.

England's volunteers filled her armies, and constituted her impregnable strength.

But while the Parliament of Great Britain is not limited in its powers by written terms, and can therefore legally resort to conscription, the Government of the United States is the creature of separate, independent, sovereign States; and while this Government is supreme within the limits of the powers delegated to it in writing, *it has no existence outside those limits.*

To ascertain what those limits are, we simply appeal to the written limitations.

It may have become heretical to say this, but I venture to say it, nevertheless.

When a written contract prescribes what a corporation may do, it can hardly be treason if I ask for a perusal of the contract.

If, after having read the Constitution, we differ as to its construction, we can either agitate against it—as New England did during the War of 1812—or we can endeavor to draw out of it—as the Southern States did in 1860—or we can go to law about it, as the Railroads do, when they disapprove State and Federal legislation; or as the millionaires did, in 1893, when they indignantly resented the idea of allowing a Democratic Congress tax their incomes.

In other words, when we challenge the right of Congress to pass a certain law, it is our privilege to appeal to the Judicial branch of the Government.

We can lawfully ask the judges to construe the contract, and to decide whether or not Congress has exceeded its powers.

In quite a few instances, Congress has inadvertently made an ass of itself, by undertaking to do what it had no authority to do.

The Judiciary has been painfully constrained to remind Congress of these instances of mental aberration, and to run the Judicial blue pencil through these asinine "laws."

Of course you will understand, that in all these cases, *Congress* has stoutly maintained that *it* acted correctly, and that *the Judges* were the mules; but it is not for me—a mere worm of the dust—to say who was accurate in describing the other branch of the Government.

All that *I* can be expected to be certain of is, that the Judiciary blue-penciled the laws, and the laws went to limbo.

This, as a concrete fact, left the Judges very much on top.

Only a few days ago, the U. S. Supreme Court had to chasten Congress in the matter of punishing a citizen for contempt; and the whole country listened with approval, when that supreme tribunal said to Congress, in substance—

"In your pursuit of District Attorney Marshall, you have exceeded your powers, and your proceedings are null and void: therefore, *they are quashed!*"

Not only was the Income-tax law of 1893 set aside as unconstitutional, but the Sherman anti-Trust act was virtually annulled, and the Pure Food law radically changed.

At this very time, the State of Georgia lies under a mandate from the U. S. Court in Atlanta, which forbids her to lower her freight rates.

Everybody remembers how Judge Jones was constantly shackling Alabama with injunctions.

Nobody can have forgotten how Judge Pritchard issued judicial orders to the State of North Carolina.

Ever since the famous "Slaughter House" cases of St. Louis, the Judiciary has taken jurisdiction over petitions, duly presented, which raise the question—

Is this law constitutional?

Doesn't every one remember that the Railroad managers threatened to disobey the Adamson 8-hour law, until the Sureme Court could pass on it?

Didn't the daily papers state that the Government would actively endeavor to have the Court give right of way to the case, with a view to a speedy decision?

All these matters are within common knowledge, and they are so recent that I am amazed at the threats being thrown out, with the apparent purpose of intimidating all citizens who are inclined to appeal to the Judiciary against the Conscription Act.

Such threats are not only an outrage against the constitutional rights of citizenship, but are an affront to that branch of the Government *whose supreme prerogative and duty it is to protect the citizen from Congressional usurpation.*

If the citizen may no longer fly to the City of Refuge, then raze the City, and sow salt in its ashes!

(1.) Does the Constitution give to Congress the power to raise an army by compulsion?

(2.) Does the Constitution give Congress the authority to make war-appropriations extending over a period of 30 years?

Our forefathers were so well-informed as to the baleful consequences of standing armies, so keenly alive to the fatal results of standing armies upon personal liberty and civil rights, that any proposal, in the Constitutional Convention, to clothe the Federal Government with the royal prerogative of maintaining troops, would have been rejected with universal horror and indignation.

Every student of the long struggle of Englishmen to assert the rights of man, against the tyrannical abuses of royal power, knows, *that the last reliance of arbitrary kings was, the blind obedience of professional soldiers, kept in the king's pay, and educated to scorn the civilian population.*

The military caste, like the hierarchal priestly caste, was

always undemocratic, was always ready to massacre the people, and was therefore always the surest prop of a despotic throne.

Therefore, the Sages who met at Philadelphia, in 1787, to frame the written contract which was to fix the relations between the States and the proposed Federal Government, were most careful to safeguard the newly-won American independence against the old foe of human liberty, to-wit—*the standing army in time of peace.*

The States were to raise and control the militia, and the Federal Government was empowered to call for and use this militia in three cases, only; to repel invasion, to suppress insurrection, and to execute the laws.

To render it doubly certain that a standing army should not be established under some subterfuge, the Fathers put a provision in the Constitution *limiting war appropriations to two years.*

An army requires much money to support it, and therefore the makers of the Federal Government expressly denied to Congress the power to furnish money enough to maintain an army for more than two years!

Think of that a moment, and you will begin to realize its tremendous significance.

Congress has to give an account of its stewardship, every two years: all members of the House, and one-third of the Senate, have to go home and face the people.

Every two years, the people were to have the power to discharge the unfaithful public servant, who had gone to Washington and betrayed the democracy of his district.

With such a biennial power put into the keeping of a vigilant people, can you not see how impossible it was—as our Fathers thought—for an aristocracy, or a plutocracy, or an autocracy, or an oligarchy *to get money enough for the maintenance of a permanent standing army?*

If they had to ask Congress for it, every two years, and Congress had to answer to the people every two years, there was no chance to sneak a standing army on to the national payroll, in defiance of the people.

Every two years, the people could apply the remedy, by defeating the Congressmen who had voted money to the standing army.

But if Congress raises, by huge issues of bonds, enough money to support the standing army 10 years, or 20 years, what remedy can the people apply?

There is the plain letter of the Constitution limiting the

power of Congress to two-year appropriations; yet the whole country is being canvassed, by the most extraordinary methods, in the interest of a war-loan of two thousand million dollars, extending over a period of 30 years!

Is it lawful to violate the law?

Is it treason to ask the question?

As to the forcible seizure of men for military service, it is abhorrent to the fundamental principles of democracy, and repugnant to the Constitution of the Union.

Democracy and compulsion are not compatible, the one with the other. Where one exists, the other must expire. Where one dwells, the other must vacate.

The very essence and spirit of democracy is, *volunteer* action. It is the voluntary adoption of a system in which *a minority* agree voluntarily to submit, even to what they do not approve, when a majority adopt it, *by those free and voluntary methods of voting which they originally agreed on*, and within the limits of the agreement.

In construing a treaty between nations, or a constitution made for a government, common sense dictates that words and phrases should be given the meaning which they bore at that time.

For example, if we were construing a feudal compact in which the word "villein" occurred, we would not be authorized to say that it meant *a scoundrel*, as the word now does: we would have to say it meant, *a peasant*, bound to his lord and to the land of his lord, *by feudal law*.

So, when we come upon the brief sentence in the U. S. Constitution which gives to Congress the authority "to raise armies," we must seek for its meaning by the light of the English custom, and common understanding.

How had English armies been "raised," ever since the era of Feudalism?

What has been *the universal custom*, for centuries? What had been *the only* meaning attached to the words, "to raise armies"?

The answer deals a stunning blow to those who contend that General Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison, Richard Henry Lee, Edmund Randolph, Luther Martin and the other makers of the Constitution meant *conscription*.

The invariable and immemorial custom of England had been, to "raise armies," by hiring volunteers. This custom was not confined to England, but was common to all Europe.

Prussia was the first State which adopted forced service in the army; and Prussia did not begin the infernal system until the 18th century, when the half-crazy father of Frederick the Great became the Father of Prussian Militarism.

Therefore, by the rational and customary rules of construction, the words "to raise armies," must be held to mean the same as if the sentence read—

"To raise armies in the same manner that armies have been raised in the Mother Country for the last several hundred years"; that is, *by securing voluntary enlistments.*

Every one who is familiar with the literature of the 18th and 19th centuries, remembers the recruiting sergeant and the King's shilling. The sergeant sought out idle fellows at taverns and other places, wheedled them with blarney, plied them with drink, prevailed upon them to accept the King's shilling, and the recruit was hooked. Of course, this does not apply to the great bulk of the army, for it was made up of patriots who had rushed to the colors, at the tap of the drum, when the needs of the country called.

If Congress can forcibly take a million men for military service, for one year, it can as legally take ten millions, for ten years.

If Congress can legally deprive your boy of his liberty for one year, it can legally condemn him to the army, for life.

A *volunteer recruit* is bound by the terms of enlistment; and he may be sent to Canada, Mexico, the Philippines, or to Terra del Fuego; but no citizen can be legally *conscripted*, and forced to bear arms, *outside the United States.*

Such a thing is foreign to the very spirit of democracy, and to the nature of our Government.

If Congress is supreme in the matter, then Congress is vested with a sovereignty the States never had, and which the King of England never had.

If Congress possesses this supreme despotic power, where did Congress get it?

The States never possessed despotic powers, because the States were *democracies*, not despotisms.

In each State, the people limited the power of government by written instrument; and the power to annul this instrument and make a new one, still remains with the people of each State.

The States, in their turn, limited the power of the Central Government which they voluntarily created; and the power

to amend the written instrument, which creates it and limits its authority, was expressly reserved to the States.

As all men know, this reserved power of revising the written instrument, and adding to it, for the purpose of making it plainer, or of extending its scope, has been exercised, again and again.

Consequently, all the facts and all the reasoning go to show, that the makers of the Government never intended to give Congress the terrible power to destroy our republican form of government by means of a standing army, *raised by compulsion*, maintained by enormous appropriations extending over a period *of more than two years*, and so revolutionized that the Federal Government is in supreme command, *all the time.*

If Congress is allowed thus to illegally combine the mighty forces of purse and sword, then, it's a long Farewell to the liberties for which your ancestors fought and died, in countless struggles against the damnable partnership of Pope and King.

As reported by the International News Service of May 30th, President Wilson said, in his Memorial address at Arlington:

"In the providence of God, America will have an opportunity to show that she was born to serve mankind."

"We are saying to all mankind that we did not set this Government up in order that we might have a selfish and separate liberty. We are now ready to come to your assistance and fight out upon fields of the world the cause of human liberty. In this thing, America attains her full dignity and full fruition of her great purpose."

If you can filter this sentimental moonshine into something tangible and practical, you are gifted with more grey matter than God gave to me.

If that sort of talk means anything at all, it means, that, after we shall have rectified governmental affairs in Europe, we must next turn our Quixotic attention to Asia, and then to Africa, and then to Oceanica: and after we shall have remodelled the internal concerns of India, Persia, Turkey, Afghanistan, China, Japan, and a few other countries where conditions are not so ideal as they are in this Republic—this Republic where the cats and dogs of the beneficiaries of Special Privilege are pampered aristocrats, while the masses who really perform the toil which produces wealth are sunk in such despair that starvation stalks among millions—when, I say, we shall have finished our circuit of Creation, as universal redressers of national wrongs, we may at length be content

to come home, and stay there, and attend to our own business.

Continuing his sentimental outpouring of verbal moonshine, the President said—

"We have said in the beginning that we planted this great Government that men who wished freedom might have a place of refuge and a place where their hope could be realized, and now, having established such a Government, having preserved such a Government, having vindicated the power of such a Government, we are saying to all mankind: 'We did not set this Government up in order that we might have a selfish and separate liberty, for we are now ready to come to your assistance and fight out on the field of the world the cause of human liberty.' In this thing America attains her full dignity and the full fruition of her great purpose.

"No man can be glad that such things have happened as we have witnessed in these last fateful years, but perhaps it may be permitted to us to be glad that we have an opportunity to show the principles that we profess to be living principles, that live in our hearts and to have a chance by the pouring out of our blood and treasure to vindicate the thing which we have said we wished to do."

"Pouring out our blood and treasure," to demonstrate the glorious fact that our Fathers did not establish this Government for themselves and their posterity—as they *said* they *did*—but established it, in order that Professor Woodrow Wilson might have a sort of international tripod, which he could periodically mount, and from which he could deliver such oracular and meaningless utterances as were never before heard among sane moderns.

The idea that our Constitution and our Government were created by Washington, Madison, Franklin, and Hamilton for the purpose of universal interference with the forms of government of all the rest of mankind, is the craziest notion that has entered anybody's head, *since* President Wilson said that there is such a thing as being too proud and too right to fight.

And the fact which fairly dumbfounds us is, that it has only been six months since this same Professor Woodrow Wilson was asking all the European belligerents to explain what they were fighting about; and was benevolently beseeching them to compose their differences "without victory for either side."

It simply stupefies us to recall, that it has only been six months, since the Professor was sweetly assuring the Kaiser, through Ambassador Gerard, of his distinguished consideration and cordial regards!

In the Berlin speech of Ambassador Gerard, the German autocracy was warmly assured that, so long as Gerard's "friends" Bethman-Hollweg, Zimmermann, Ludendorff, Hindenburg, Von Tirpitz, &c., remained in power, there would be

no rupture between the German autocracy and the American democracy.

Alas, for the fallibility of ambassadorial prophets!

Mr. Gerard's "friends" are still in office in Berlin. Chancellor Bethman-Hollweg is the same old seven and six. Dr. Zimmermann presides at the Foreign Office, as usual: Ludendorff, and Hindenburg, and Von Tirpitz have undergone no observable alteration: the Kaiser is still confident that he is the junior partner of the Almighty; and German atrocities are not a whit more atrocious than they had constantly and devilishly been for two years, *before* Mr. Ambassador Gerard assured his atrocious German "friends" that, if *they* remained in office, there would be no disturbance of the friendly relations between German autocracy and American democracy.

Mr. Ambassador Gerard, speaking to his official German "friends," on the night of January 7th, 1917, in Berlin, said—

"Never since the beginning of the war have the relations between Germany and the United States been so cordial as now. **I have brought back an olive branch from the president—or don't you consider the president's message an olive branch?**

"I personally am convinced that as long as Germany's fate is directed by such men as **my friend, the chancellor,** and Dr. Helferrich and Dr. Sbolf; by Admirals von Capelle (minister of the navy), Holtzendorff (head of the naval general staff) and von Mueller (naval adviser to the emperor), by Generals von Hindenburg (chief of the general staff), and Ludenorff (first quartermaster general), and last, but not least, **by my friend Zimmermann, the relations between the two countries are running no risk.**"

"Germany's fate is" *still* "directed by my friend the Chancellor."

Germany's fate is still directed "last, but not least, by my friend Zimmermann."

But where's the olive branch?

"*I have brought you back an olive branch from the President.*"

An olive branch in January, of this year, six months ago.

An olive branch, after all the atrocities of the autocracies.

An olive branch, *after* the sinking of American vessels, and the murder of American sailors!

An olive branch, *after* the massacre of 119 American men, women and children on the *Lusitania!*

An olive branch, after the atrocious sinking of the *Sussex*, the *Arabic*, the dropping of bombs upon hospitals, the murders of non-combatants in unfortified towns, the dynamiting

of American munition plants and the assassination, in cold blood, of hundreds of innocent American bread-winners.

An olive branch from the President of the United States to the Emperor William, whose autocracy has suddenly become so intolerable, that President Wilson must sweep aside all his previous speeches, obliterate the Constitution of his country, and dedicate this Republic to the unheard of mission, of world-regeneration!

To what purpose did its makers dedicate this Government?

They soberly and practically declared, in the familiar Preamble to the Constitution, that *their* purpose in creating the Federal Government was—

"To form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty *to ourselves and our posterity.*"

That's sane! That's practical. And that's all that the Constitution authorizes Congress and the President to undertake.

When they commit themselves to any other purposes, they are acting outside the law which brought them into existence.

When they employ the vast powers of the Federal Government for any other objects than those stated by the Makers of the Constitution, their conduct is usurpatory.

When they embark upon chimerical, visionary, Quixotic designs of carrying "liberty," by "blood and treasure," to the balance of the world, they abandon the known channels of navigation, they throw down the chart and the compass; and they recklessly drive the ship of state into a shoreless sea, without the slightest assurance that any safe mooring will ever be made again.

The President now says that "we did not set this Government up, in order that we might have a selfish and separate liberty."

The Sages who made the government declared, that they *did* set it up, *for that very purpose.*

They were creating a government for *us*, and for our own country—selfishly and separately.

No other government ever was created for any other purpose.

Every government is *necessarily* selfish and separate.

Ireland is howling for one, right now, and this very Congress went out of its way to back her in it.

Russia recently tried her hand at one, and we are backing Russia.

England's government is for England and the English: France's government is for France and the French: the American government was sanely intended for America and the Americans.

Any other idea, is sheer sentimentalism.

It will not bear the slightest test of *reason;* and the country would have laughed it to scorn, *six months ago.*

The President himself scorned it, last Fall!

Addressing a crowd at his New Jersey home — Shadow Lawn — in October, he warned the American people against changing our foreign policy, and he was universally understood to be referring to Mr. Roosevelt and others of the same way of thinking, who were then clamoring for war.

President Wilson then said—

Shadow Lawn, N. J., Oct. 14.—The American people have no disposition to "exchange a handsome certainty for an unhandsome uncertainty," President Wilson declared this afternoon from the porch of the autumn White House in a speech more sulphuric than any he has thus far hurled at republicanism and its leaders.

His talk warned against the sinister influences of campaign bosses and of the dangers of changing the American foreign policy now.

Compare the rational tone of this sort of talk—*which satisfied the American people so thoroughly that they gave Mr. Wilson a second term*—with the vague, dreamy, fantastic visions which have since taken possession of Professor Wilson's mind, and you cannot fail to be deeply impressed by the irreconcilable difference between the two positions.

In October, he was rebuking Roosevelt, Lodge, Hughes, and Company; and contending, substantially, that we must stay on the safe side, according to the time-honored policy of our Government.

Now, however, he completely changes his position. In fact, he *exactly* reverses it.

He now demands enormous sums of money, enormous numbers of conscripted soldiers, and enormous personal powers, in order that he may "exchange a handsome certainty for an unhandsome uncertainty": and he now says, in effect, that our Fathers did not know what they were talking about, when they solemnly declared, that they established this Government for "*ourselves* and our *posterity.*"

By some esoteric mental process—veiled from the eye of the

average biped; a mysterious process, inexplicable, inscrutable, elusive to ordinary minds, and evidently set apart for the rapturous approval of the spirits of just men made perfect—Professor Woodrow Wilson has hypnotized himself into the belief, that George Washington, James Madison, Benjamin Franklin and the rest of the Fathers, were not incubating at Philadelphia, to hatch out "a *more perfect union*" of the American States; but were intellectually sailing through the iridescent realms of transcendentalism, in search of an ideal government for "mankind"—a sort of international Don Quixote, commissioned to rove throughout the universe, tilting against all the windmills in creation; and setting up an International Court, to pass upon international affairs, and to enforce its judgments upon all recalcitrant peoples and autocracies, by means of American armies, *raised by compulsion.*

The Jeffersonian believed and said, that our Government should never have tolerated German atrocities as long as it did. Bernstorff should have been dismissed when he inserted those insolent advertisements in the papers, warning our citizens not to exercise their legal right of taking passage on the *Lusitania.*

The Germans should not have been left in charge of the wireless stations in New Jersey and New York.

Those stations rendered vast services to Germany, all the time she was butchering our citizens on the sea and upon our own soil.

More than two years ago, we should have broken with Germany, and gone into the War *with our fleet.*

It was on the ocean that Germany had made war upon our rights, and surely our magnificent fleet is able to have made good our vengeance upon the murderous, lawless U-boats of Germany.

If Col. Roosevelt and 200,000 Americans wanted to fight in Europe, as volunteers, I would have said, "Go!"

But beyond this, I never even dreamed of going; and the very idea of forcing young men into the Army for the purpose of having them take part in the land-fighting in France, or elsewhere in Europe, is abhorrent to all my life-long conceptions of democratic principles and constitutional liberty.

Deliberately and without passion, I declare that, in my judgment, the present policy of the President and Congress is far more fatal to our republic, than any of the legislation of the Black Republican, immediately following the War between the States.

If it were so that I could, I would dearly love to argue the unconstitutionality of the Conscription law, before such a good constitutional lawyer as Judge Emory Speer.

The very first Amendment to the Constitution of the United States declares that—

"*Congress shall make no law . . . . abridging . . . . the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.*"

Parallel with this constitutional right, runs the right of appeal to the U. S. Courts, whenever the citizen believes that Congress has invaded his constitutional rights.

If our people feel aggrieved by this revolutionary Conscript law, with its 30-year war appropriation, they can peaceably assemble and petition the government for the redress of the grievance.

This is an old English right, and it has often caused the government of England to halt.

If the people see fit to exercise this constitutional right, and should peaceably assemble, not only to petition the government against this monstrous grievance, but to employ lawyers to bring test cases in the Federal Courts, *I hereby volunteer my services*, FREE OF CHARGE.

In such an event, I would only ask that a sufficient fund be raised to engage the services of younger attorneys, who would relieve me of the manual labor and the drudgery of the case.

I am perfectly willing to make the leading argument before Judge Speer, and in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Against this unsane and unconstitutional experiment, announced by the President in his Memorial address, the people should protest, by mass-meetings and petitions, which the Constitution authorizes, *for just such purposes.*

It was in February, 1915, that Germany declared her blockade of the British Isles: it was soon afterwards that President Wilson published the bold, legal, and patriotic response to Germany's insolent challenge.

That response contained the well-known threat, to hold "to strict accountability" any aggressor who destroyed American property or lives, in violation of the Law of Nations.

Mr. Bryan, Secretary of State, called at the office of the Austrian ambassador, Dr. Dumba, and told him, that Germany and her allies need not take the President's note seriously.

Our Secretary of State assured Dr. Dumba that the pub-

lished paper, which he had officially signed, did not mean what it said, but was only meant for "home consumption."

That is to say, Secretary Bryan told Ambassador Dumba, that he and the President had concocted the "strict accountability" note, to bamboozle the American people!

Are these fearful facts denied?

No: they are admitted.

Mr. Bryan confessed his part in the affair, during last year's campaign; and he publicly defended his own duplicity, by alleging that the President was a party to it.

Did the President deny Mr. Bryan's astounding statement?

He did not.

After this episode—unparalleled in American history—began the long-drawn-out interchange of letters, between the President and the German Government, all of which pivoted upon the demand, that Germany should conduct her maritime warfare in accordance with the established canons of International law.

As everybody remembers, that prolonged correspondence finally became a standing joke.

But when the campaign opened last year, the Democratic managers published a book in which they said, that Germany had at length "disavowed" the sinking of the *Lusitania.*

Was the statement true?

No: it was not true.

It was merely another publication for "home consumption."

Then in December, came the President's "Peace paper," calling upon all the European fighters to explain what they were fighting about, and to definitely state the terms upon which they would make peace.

This peace-maker effort of the President extended into January of this year, and finally collapsed when Germany, refusing to define her terms, made the counter proposal for a general Conference of the Powers.

Have I not stated the case fairly and accurately?

IF NOT, CORRECT ME!

What, then, is the literal truth?

The undeniable, absolute truth is, that, so late as *five months ago*, President Wilson wanted to make peace "without victory," and without annexations, leaving every European to its own government, and leaving all German atrocities unavenged!

Suddenly, he changes; and when he *does* change, he doesn't stop where The Jeffersonian and so many others had so long wanted him *to go;* but he passes the station of *defensive war-*

fare; passes the station of *setting our fleet to combat the German vessels;* and even passes the stage of *volunteers* for service abroad.

When the President *does* change, he flies to the other extreme; and after having been eager, *in February*, to make peace with Germany, leaving everything in *statu quo*, he commits himself, *in March*, to the present programme of *conscripting* a mighty host of young men, and *forcing them to fight the battles of Europe*, upon the idea that our forefathers did not set up this Government "in order that we might have a selfish and separate liberty."

With almost incredible extravagance of language, the President now says, that it is our national mission to tell "mankind" that, "we are now ready to come to your assistance, and fight out, *upon the fields of the world*, the cause of human liberty."

The President is thus reported in all the Northern papers, as well as by the International News Service.

Accordingly, when the American hosts — forcibly drawn from our fields, mills, mines, stores, banks, shops, and offices — shall have smashed autocracy in Central Europe, it will be their high, chivalric, and constitutional duty to at once *pull Japan off China.*

Having carried "liberty" to the Germans, we must not fail to carry it to the Chinks.

And having freed the Chinks from the Japs, our high, chivalric mission will imperatively demand, that we *drive England out of Egypt*, *India*, *Ceylon*, *Burmah*, and a few other little patches of earth that she has "benevolently assimilated."

"We did not set up this Government in order that we might have a selfish and separate liberty."

If that amazing statement is true, there must be some way of proving it.

If our Government was set up, as a kind of militant international eleemosynary institution, dedicated to an utopian propaganda of sublimated political panaceas, George Washington must have known something about it.

If our Government is an International Aid-Society, then Washington was a charter member, for he presided when the Constitution was made, and when the Government was born.

Will you listen to Washington, the Father of his country?

In his Farewell Address, he said:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; time and experience prove that foreign in-

fluence is one of the most baneful foes of Republican Government. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil, and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient Government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of such a peculiar situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

President Wilson is theoretically the successor of the first Democratic President.

Theoretically, Mr. Wilson is not only the official successor of Thomas Jefferson, but is a scholar in his school of politics.

While it is true that scholars sometimes outgrow their masters, it is not often that they apostatise, while still wearing the garb of the school and professing loyalty to the head-master.

In order that you may judge for yourself whether the most recent addresses of President Wilson, outlining his purpose to "pour out blood and treasure"—not *his* blood and not *his* treasure—in the visionary "fruition" of America's purpose to liberate "mankind," I will ask you to read a portion of President Jefferson's first Inaugural.

The Hon. William L. Wilson, who put into successful operation the amendment to the Post Office Bill of February, 1893, *requiring the Government to experiment with the free delivery of country mails*, says, in his standard "History of the National Democratic Party," that Mr. Jefferson's address "*is the best exposition ever made of the fundamental principles of the party whose leader he was.*"

This Inaugural, says Mr. Wilson, "has become *the creed*

of our political faith, the text of civil instruction, THE TOUCHSTONE BY WHICH TO TRY THE SERVICES OF THOSE WE TRUST."

Pray consider well those words.

There never lived a truer, purer, braver patriot, than William L. Wilson, of West Virginia. I knew him personally, served with him, followed him in the great Tariff fight of the 56th Congress, and respected him most sincerely.

He quotes our Jeffersonian creed as follows:

"Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—**ENTANGLING ALLIANCES WITH NONE**; **the support of the State governments in their rights**, as the most competent administration for our domestic concerns, and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; **a jealous care of the right of election by the people**—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; **a well-disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace AND FOR THE FIRST MOMENTS OF WAR, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened**; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; **encouragement of agriculture, and commerce as its handmaid**; the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; **freedom of the press**; **freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus, and trial by juries impartially selected**—these principles from the high constellation which has gone before us, and guided our footsteps through an age of revolution and reformation."

I hope that it is neither treason nor sedition, to remind "mankind," that Professor Woodrow Wilson was not put at the head of the Government for the purpose of voyaging uncharted seas, in search of Golden Fleece, or for the restoration of a fabled Golden Age, but was sworn in, *to behave himself according to law.*

This is the oath he took:

"I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, *preserve*, *protect*, *and* DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

Now, the Constitution *states*, in so many plain words, that it was intended to form a more perfect Union, and to perpetuate the liberties of "ourselves and our posterity."

In other words, the Constitution says that its purpose *is* to establish "a selfish and separate liberty."

President Wilson is bound by a solemn oath *to take the Constitution as he finds it.*

When Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty, or give me death!" what did he mean?

What is the definition of the word "liberty"?

In the United Editors' Encyclopedia and Dictionary, you will find that the word means, "freedom from restraint, *freedom of power of choice, as opposed to necessity.*"

What is conscription?

Just the reverse of liberty!

Therefore, according to the President and Congress, Patrick Henry risked his life in battling for the exact opposite of what has recently been imposed upon us, without any authority from the Constitution.

In Australia, the question of conscription was referred by the government to the people; but in the United States, it was assumed by those in power that the young men of the country were cowards, slackers, and shirkers; and they were cartooned and abused in the daily papers, before they even had a chance to show their patriotic manhood.

Nobody can reasonably doubt that, if our country were invaded, every able-bodied man would instantly be eager for service in defense of our soil.

But to send an army across the ocean, when we have not been attacked on land, strikes the average man as a wild-goose chase; *and he cannot avoid the suspicion, that the purpose of it is antagonistic to our own best interests and to our blood-bought liberties.*

Democracy constrains no man, outside the constitutional powers granted by the people to the government; and COMPULSION, *whether by a Kaiser or a Congress,* IS TYRANNY, when it oversteps the boundaries of the powers delegated to the Government.

That man is blind who cannot see, *that the Spirit of Tyranny is abroad in the land,* taking various forms of COMPULSION, and FORCING PRUSSIANISM UPON US, at the very time the Government pretends to be fighting it.

What are the remedies?

The Constitution itself provides *one,* and forbids Congress to ever abridge it: that method consists *in peaceable assemblies,* orderly discussion, declaratory resolutions, and remonstrant *petitions to the Government.*

The other perfectly legal and adequate remedy—as Daniel

Webster claimed—was stated in the famous Reply to Hayne, which, as some historians have said, had the force of a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Webster argued, that the Constitution is not a contract, and does not form a League, but is a constitution proper and creates a government: therefore, the States cannot legally nullify the laws of Congress, nor evade them by seceding from the Union, *but must test their Constitutionality*—wherever the case admits of it—*by an appeal to the United States Courts.*

Mr. Webster, the Great Expounder of the Hamiltonian school, was himself the superb lawyer who frequently appeared in the U. S. Supreme Court, to combat the constitutionality of State laws and acts of Congress.

I plant myself squarely on the Websterian ground, of the celebrated Debate; and I contend that Webster's doctrine, which our U. S. Supreme Court has so often sustained, offers to my people — deserted by recreant office-holders, and betrayed by a venal press—a legal remedy for the revolutionary measures which have been so amazingly sprung upon us, so very soon after Mr. Wilson was re-elected to the slogan of "He kept us out of war."

My countrymen! if you allow this conscript law to stand *uncontested in the courts*, your posterity will have as much right to reproach your memory, *for liberties pusillanimously lost*, as you have to glorify the memories of your ancestors, FOR LIBERTIES HEROICALLY WON.

I have said my say, and I am done. God guide you, my people! Many and many a time, in the years gone by, I have fought your battles, with tongue and pen, when the clouds hung low overhead, and the wind from the East blew hard; but never have I felt so deeply depressed as I now do, at the sudden turn which the Government has taken, since the President's second inauguration.

As Patrick Henry said, "I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience."

All my studies of government, all my reading of history, tell me, but too plainly, that such laws as have been *suddenly fastened on you*, WITHOUT CONSULTING YOU, lead inevitably to the destruction of individual liberty, and to the establishment of a military despotism.

Watson's Magazine

(Monthly)

$1.00 PER YEAR IN SINGLE COPIES
FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN CLUBS OF TEN

The Jeffersonian

(Weekly)

$1.00 PER YEAR IN SINGLE COPIES
FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN CLUBS OF TEN

Both Publications to One Address, $1.50 Per Year

CLUBS MAY BE MADE FOR BOTH
PUBLICATIONS AT THE FIFTY-CENT RATE

When Checks are sent, add 10 cents for Exchange.
Do not send stamps for more than $1.00.
Sample Copies on request.

ADDRESS ALL ORDERS TO

THE JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING Co.

THOMSON, GA.

THE HOUSE OF HAPSBURG

By Thos. E. Watson

The Latest of Mr. Watson's Historical Works States Cause of Present European War.

Shows the Origin of the Present House of Hapsburg; The Growth of the Papal Power of Rome.

John Huss, John Wickliffe, Martin Luther, the Thirty Years War and the Reformation.

ILLUSTRATED—96 Pages

Stiff Paper Cover; Well Printed; Good Type

50 Cents Postpaid

JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING CO.,

Thomson, Georgia

THIS SERIES OF PAMPHLETS

By Thos. E. Watson.

1 Oath of 4th Degree Knights of Columbus
2 Is there a Roman Catholic Peril?
3 The Inevitable Crimes of Celibacy
4 What Goes on in the Nunneries?
5 The Italian Pope's Campaign Against the Constitutional Rights of American Citizens.

For 35c. - - - Postpaid.

After reading this series of pamphlets, a clear, concise, understanding will be had of the effort to

MAKE AMERICA CATHOLIC

and of the disastrous results that will follow.

The Jeffersonsian Publishing Co.,

THOMSON, GA.

THE MASSACRE
OF
ST. BARTHOLOMEW
NEW EDITION

IF you read the serial articles dealing with this awful chapter of Roman Catholic persecution, in France, four hundred years ago, you must have realized that you had never seen the subject treated in as forceful, interesting and absolutely historically correct manner as Mr. Watson handled it.

The articles created a sensation, and the demands for the Magazine containing the installments were sold out—and no more could be had.

Mr. Watson has carefully edited the matter, added much more to it, and the book is now ready for delivery.

Send in your order for

THE MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW

By THOS. E. WATSON

Profusely illustrated and splendidly printed.

PRICE 25 CENTS.

THE JEFFERSONIAN PUB. CO.

THOMSON. GEORGIA

Some Editions of Some of Our Books

New Edition of

Life and Speeches of Thos. E. Watson

Price $1.00

Now Being Mailed Out

The Woman of Babylon

which ran as a serial in the Magazine, is now ready for mailing. Price $1.00

Prose Miscellanies

New Edition, also now being made ready. Price $1.00.

Send 25 Cents

for a collection of short, snappy, interesting booklets on the ROMAN Catholic question.

The Jeffersonian Publishing Co.,
Thomson, - Ga.

The Roman Catholic Hierarchy

A BOOK WHICH IS THE RESULT OF YEARS OF STUDY

By Thos. E. Watson

Contains historical data showing the evolution of the Papacy, and its adoption of Pagan ceremonies and rites.

It cites Roman Catholic theological authorities, whose instructions to priests as to questions to be asked women caused Mr. Watson to be indicted.

Richly illustrated *Price, $1.00*

Jeffersonian Pub. Co.

Thomson, Ga.